DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 951 EA 011 969

AUTHOR Garibaldi, Antoine M., Ed.
TITLE In-School Alternatives to Suspension: Conference Report.
INSTITUTION National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 79
CONTRACT 400-76-0022
NOTE 174p.
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock No. 017-080-020-38-6; $5.00)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Counseling Programs; *Discipline Policy; Program Development; School Policy; *Suspension; Timeout
IDENTIFIERS *Alternatives to Suspension; Goss v Lopez; Parent Teacher Association

ABSTRACT

In April 1978 the National Institute of Education held a conference to explore alternative approaches to suspension as a disciplinary procedure. This publication reproduces the proceedings of this conference. The proceedings reflect a cross-section of opinion on alternative programs provided by panelists and speakers from many sectors of the educational community. Highlighted were such considerations as legal issues in the discipline process, effective implementation and organization of programs, and the status of discipline in public education. A presentation by Junious Williams detailed the pros and cons of alternative programs, as well as presenting recent figures on suspension and expulsion in the nation's schools. Hayes Mizell offered a discussion on components essential to implementation of inschool alternative programs. Eight directors of inschool alternative programs presented detailed descriptions of their alternative plans. The Honorable Shirley Chisholm delivered a keynote address proposing a policy among federal agencies promoting the design of more alternative education and employment programs for youth. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED173951

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION: CONFERENCE REPORT

April 16-18, 1978

Antoine M. Garibaldi, Editor

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Joseph A. Califano, Jr., Secretary
Mary F. Berry, Assistant Secretary for Education

National Institute of Education
Patricia Albjerg Graham, Director
Program on Educational Policy and Organization
Marc S. Tucker, Associate Director

April 1979

EA 011 969

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

This conference was sponsored by the National Institute of Education under contract NIE-400-76-0022. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and discussants and do not reflect the position or policy of the NIE or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. No official endorsement should be inferred.

FOREWORD

In the last few years, the American educational community has adopted a new perspective concerning the maintenance and control of school discipline. Suspension of students who exhibit socially unacceptable behavior is no longer an ultimate disciplinary measure for many administrators. Recent reports and research studies have reminded the public of the abuses and excesses of suspensions: that more black students than white students are suspended; that suspension for truancy and class cutting in fact "rewards" students with the very release from school they are seeking; and that suspended students often are those who can least afford to miss academic instruction.

Further, suspension not only harms students by depriving them of valuable instruction; it also harms communities, where students may loiter before returning home, and it harms the individual school and school district, which must forfeit funds based on average daily attendance formulas. Except in extreme circumstances, other disciplinary measures would seem preferable.

Given these considerations, educators in increasing numbers are seeking to institute in-school alternatives to suspension that identify and treat the problems that lead to school disruption. Counseling programs, time-out rooms, referral centers, and a plethora of other approaches have emerged across the country. But few have become widely known or been carefully evaluated. Clearly, the need existed for a national forum to present the best thinking on in-school alternatives -- the need, types of programs, considerations in implementation, and views of various participants in school systems.

In the summer of 1977, a Student Suspension Committee was formed to coordinate the reevaluation of Federal efforts in this area so as to make these efforts more responsive to the need for action in reducing suspensions. A committee member from the National Institute of Education, Oliver Moles, who then headed the NIE School Social Relations Staff, agreed that this unit would conduct several knowledge-building and dissemination activities on factors influencing suspensions and alternatives in the school. One of these efforts was a 2-day conference on in-school alternatives to suspension held in Washington, D.C., in April 1978. This volume is a product of that conference.

The proceedings of the conference bear testimony not only to the depth and diversity of the presentations, but also to the skill of the conference organizers, Antoine Garibaldi and Oliver Moles, in assembling an informed group of participants on such a timely topic.

Peter D. Relic
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Education
U.S. Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare

PREFACE

As many school districts have sought to reduce the high number of student suspensions, in-school alternatives to suspension have developed rapidly throughout the country during the last few years. The implementation of in-school alternatives to suspension has been seen from differing perspectives. From the perspective of the educational community, these programs signal an attempt by many school districts to decrease reliance on suspension as an ultimate method of disciplining students who violate school rules. However, many student advocates concerned with the educational process have vigilantly monitored the evolution of these special programs for a number of reasons. Two of their specific concerns are that these programs not jeopardize the due process rights of students and that students not miss valuable instructional time as a result of being taken out of the regular classroom.

Because this area of program development is new and intriguing, yet not well understood, the National Institute of Education, in April 1978, sponsored a conference designed specifically to explore and illuminate various aspects of alternative approaches to suspension. Attending the conference were more than 600 educators, parents, lawyers, social scientists, student advocates, and interested and concerned citizens.

During the conference, a cross-section of opinion on alternative programs was provided by panelists and speakers from various sectors of the educational community. These people also highlighted other considerations raised by in-school alternatives: legal issues, parent and community involvement in the discipline process, effective implementation and organization of these programs, the status of discipline in public education, and the like.

The presentation by Junious Williams provided a detailed delineation of the pros and cons of alternative programs, as well as a terse discussion of recent figures on suspension and expulsion in the nation's schools. A taxonomy of in-school alternatives to suspension was outlined by this author to demonstrate the various approaches taken to this new educational concept. And Hayes Mizell offered a thorough discussion on components essential to implementation of in-school alternative programs. The presentations of Williams and Mizell were discussed by a school area superintendent, a university professor, another professor who is also a school principal, and a state education official.

Eight directors of in-school alternative programs offered detailed descriptions of their endeavors. Each of their programs has been in operation for several years in elementary or junior high schools in various geographic areas. This group of discussants also

presented a representative sampling of the different types of school alternatives -- time-out rooms, counseling programs, and in-school suspension centers.

The conference also featured two open-forum dialogues. One, the text of which is not included in this report, dealt with Federal perspectives and included representatives of the Office of Education, the Office for Civil Rights, and other components of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The second included representatives from five national educational associations: the American Association of School Administrators, the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, the National School Boards Association, and the National Parent Teachers Association.

A highlight of the conference was the keynote address delivered by the Honorable Shirley Chisholm, a long-time advocate of educational reform and innovation. Her stirring speech clearly depicted the problems of school-based delinquency and increased suspensions, and the alienation and frustration of students. Mrs. Chisholm proposed the establishment of a coherent policy among Federal agencies to design more alternative education and employment programs for youth. In all, her speech was informative not only for educators, but also for educational policymakers and program developers.

Though it is difficult to capture the forceful presentations and lively discussions in print, I hope these proceedings will succeed in informing an interested public of the salient features of in-school alternatives and of the key issues involved in their implementation. Most of the presentations and discussions were able to be transcribed, and they are included in the following pages. It is hoped that these presentations will provide new insights, provoke more informed discussions, and give some answers to teachers, parents, and administrators on how to handle discipline problems within schools in effective and fair ways.

Antoine M. Garibaldi
National Institute of Education

CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	iii
PREFACE	v
SESSION I	
IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION: WHY BOTHER?	
Junious Williams	1
DISCUSSION OF IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION: WHY BOTHER?	
Richard Green	23
Irwin A. Hyman	26
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	33
SESSION II	
WELCOMING REMARKS	
Oliver Moles	39
Patricia Albjerg Graham	40
INTRODUCTION OF REPRESENTATIVE SHIRLEY CHISHOLM	
Belita Heron	43
KEYNOTE ADDRESS	
Honorable Shirley Chisholm	45
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	55
IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION: THE STATE OF THE ART	
Antoine M. Garibaldi	59
SESSION III	
IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION: A PANEL PRESENTATION	
Yvonne Blanchard	71
Morris Gordon	71
Lynn Pinkerton	73
Alfred Clark	77
Milton Crosby	81
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	85

Page

SESSION IV - IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION: A PANEL PRESENTATION
Richard Nelson 91
Roger Scales 95
Thomas Boyle 98
John Kackley 101

SESSION V

DISCIPLINE, SUSPENSION, AND ALTERNATIVES: AN OPEN FORUM
William Pink 107
Paul Salmon 107
Gerald Morris 109
Boyd Bosma 110
Crystal Kuykendall 114
Jean Dye 116

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS 123

SESSION VI

DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING EFFECTIVE IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION
M. Hayes Mizell 133

DISCUSSION OF DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING EFFECTIVE IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION
George P. Edmonston 151
McKinley M. Nash 154

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS 157

SESSION VII - CLOSING REMARKS
Junious Williams 163

APPENDIX: BIOGRAPHIES 169

SESSION I

IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION: WHY BOTHER?

Junious Williams, J.D.

In recent years, growing public concern has been focused on the practice of suspension as a response to incidents of student misbehavior. Although many school officials and community groups suggest that the use of suspension has dramatically increased, there are no adequate national data to establish that such a trend exists. While the data may not support the conclusion that a trend exists, they are sufficient to conclude that the use of suspension is extremely high.

Based upon data available from the 1972-73 Office for Civil Rights (OCR) survey of 2,862 schools enrolling over 24 million students, the Children's Defense Fund (CDF) reported that over one million students were suspended at least once during the school year.[1] This means that 1 in every 24 students attending in reporting districts was suspended at least once; on the secondary level, 1 in every 13 students experienced suspension.[2] Although these figures are startling enough, there is some evidence to suggest that, because of definitional problems, inadequate records, and non-reporting, these figures may seriously underrepresent the actual use of suspension in districts surveyed.[3] Whether one relies on the OCR figures or inflates them to compensate for underreporting, the fact remains that school suspensions represent a serious threat to the educational lives of young people.

The increasing awareness of the high level of suspension has created widespread concern among educators and the community at large about the necessity for school suspension, its impact upon students, and whether less disruptive alternative means can be instituted to lessen reliance upon suspension. In attempting to respond to growing legal, educational, and community concerns raised by the practice of suspension, many of the nation's schools have implemented or are developing in-school alternatives that provide the student and the school with disciplinary options that permit students to continue some level of educational activity within the school environment.

The emergence of in-school alternatives represents an important step in reducing the excessive use of suspension, and consequently can be viewed as a positive response to a serious national problem. But regardless of the admirable intent behind their creation, the alternatives must be viewed with some caution until we can determine if they can effectively address the underlying problems which lead to the high use of suspension, rather than merely submerging students into less visible programs which do not receive the public attention commanded by school suspension.

Movement toward in-school alternatives raises a number of critical questions about the practice of suspension, as well as the nature of emerging in-school alternatives. The focus of this paper is to examine some of the issues and concerns related to suspension and in-school alternatives in an attempt to address the broader question of why schools must bother spending time, energy, and resources in developing in-school alternatives.

This paper has been divided into three major sections. The first section focuses on the practice of suspension. Issues reviewed here include the purpose of suspension, why schools suspend, the reasons students are suspended, and the impact and consequences of suspension. The second section includes an examination of commonly used in-school alternatives and some of the critical questions and issues that are raised by the use of alternatives. The final section deals with the need for widening the concept of in-school alternatives to include a broader range of activities, as well as the need to begin restructuring discipline systems to more adequately reflect the needs of students, staff, and the community.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PRACTICE OF SCHOOL SUSPENSIONS

School Removals

The public schools have utilized a variety of disciplinary actions to respond to incidents of student misbehavior. These actions range in severity from the simple verbal reprimand accompanied by an admonition not to engage in the behavior again, all the way up to expulsion. Of critical concern here are those actions that involve a decision to temporarily or permanently deny a student access to his/her normal instructional activities. These actions can be collectively termed school removals. Generally, schools employ three types of removals: short-term suspensions, long-term suspensions, and expulsions.

Expulsion is the most severe disciplinary practice employed by the schools. An expulsion represents a decision by school officials, usually a local board of education, that a student may no longer attend any school operated by that local education agency. Expulsion is commonly reserved for the most serious of offenses, usually involving felonies or bodily injury.

Schools utilize two types of suspensions, which are differentiated primarily along lines of the time loss and the procedural protections associated with the decisional process.[4] Long-term suspensions involve removals lasting longer than 10 school days. They are distinguishable from expulsions in that a specific time is designated when the student may apply for readmission or is automatically reinstated. While the behaviors that precipitate long-term suspensions

vary considerably depending upon local policy, suspensions are generally used as a response to moderately serious misbehaviors or repeated behavioral infractions after short-term suspensions are felt to be ineffective.

The most frequently utilized form of school removal is the short-term suspension. The short-term suspension involves removals lasting 1 to 10 days. Short-term suspensions are usually imposed for a wide variety of minor misbehaviors.

While there is certainly a need to examine all forms of school removals as they relate to the use of in-school alternatives, expulsions, and to a lesser extent long-term suspensions, short-term suspensions raise a different set of concerns because of their more limited use and the fact that they are used, or at least should be used, as a response to serious misbehaviors which may necessitate the removal of a student to protect the physical safety of others in the school environment. Consequently, in analyzing suspension practices and the necessity for in-school alternatives, my focus will be upon the use of short-term suspensions.

The Purposes of Suspension

Considerable disagreement exists concerning what purpose a short-term suspension serves. Advocacy groups and community groups argue that short-term suspension serves few useful purposes that could not be accomplished through alternative means. However, from the school's perspective, suspension may appear to serve a number of important purposes.

Clearly, one of the overriding purposes of suspension is to force students to comply with established behavioral rules which the local board, building administrators, and teachers believe are necessary for "maintaining an atmosphere conducive to learning and teaching." Furthermore, some suggest that it also serves a more general educational purpose of helping students to learn the modes of conduct that are necessary in a free society (i.e., that there are inevitable consequences of violating rules of the society).

Another purpose attributed to suspension is to provide a cooling-off period for the student and some relief for school staff who may be frustrated by previous attempts to deal with the behavior through less severe sanctions. The cooling-off function implies that the underlying problem is primarily the need for a vacation or separation from school so that the student may simply relax from the pressures which led to the misbehavior. The rest or relief period for school staff suggests a similar purpose in that it relieves the staff of responsibility for dealing with the problem for the period of suspension.

The clearest notions of the purposes of suspension are gathered from the administrators responsible for discipline. Through interviews with administrators, the Children's Defense Fund found that administrators most frequently cite parental contact as a purpose of suspension.[5] By suspending a student, the school is able to "provoke a crisis" of significant magnitude to force parents to appear at school. The mechanism for this provocation is usually local policy requiring parents to attend a hearing or a readmission conference upon completion of the suspension.

Why Schools Use Suspension

Beyond the issue of what purpose suspension serves is the equally important concern of why schools rely so heavily on suspension. I believe that four factors are especially important in understanding why suspensions are so prevalent.

First, suspension is a very convenient device for managing discipline. Unlike alternative programs, it takes very little time and effort to utilize suspension as a primary disciplinary response. To impose a suspension in most school districts, the administrator is required only to review the facts, provide the student with an informal hearing, decide the matter, notify the parents by phone and follow-up letter, complete the necessary paperwork, and, in some cases, hold a readmission conference with parents. In most schools this system is maintained by one or two administrators with the assistance of a secretary. It requires no planning and programming, little or no monitoring, and a minimum of resources.

A related factor that helps explain why suspension is so prevalent involves the lack of alternatives. The schools' repertoire of responses to incidents of minor misbehavior is extremely limited. Even some time-honored punishments like corporal punishment may be restricted due to local policy or personal philosophy. Other options, such as after-school detention, are severely limited by pupil transportation problems and unavailability of staff beyond regular instructional hours. In a recent study of a middle school in a large metropolitan area, our interviews with building administrators revealed that, because of the limited alternatives, they saw only three options available when a student is determined to have violated rules involving minor misbehavior:

- Warn and counsel the student in a conference setting.
- Contact the parents.
- Suspend the student.[6]

It is also likely that the recent attention given to the legal aspects of managing student discipline is associated with the increased

use of suspension. As more local districts have sought to systematize student discipline practices by adopting written policies which specify prescribed behaviors and their consequences, discretion for administrators to employ particular responses has been limited. Although the intent of these policy documents is usually to ensure fair and equitable treatment of all students, they frequently fail to include less severe responses or require that such responses be exhausted before resorting to suspension.

A final factor related to the high use of suspension is school officials' perceptions that suspension is effective. Little systematic study of the effectiveness of various disciplinary measures has been undertaken. However, one available measure of suspension effectiveness is the recidivism rates of suspended students. Based on records from four Michigan secondary schools for the 1974-75 school year, we found that 24 to 47 percent of the suspensions were imposed upon students who had been suspended previously in the same school year.[7] The point here is not that suspension is ineffective for all students, but that it is not effective in preventing further misbehavior for a significant number of students.

The Reasons for Suspension

Perhaps the strongest evidence demonstrating the necessity for curtailing the use of suspension and developing alternatives is found in the analysis of the reasons why students are suspended. The recent reports of violence and vandalism in the schools might lead one to hypothesize that the increasing use of suspension represents a logical and justifiable response to growing problems of serious misbehavior and property destruction. Until recently, the hypothesis of "justified response" was difficult to test because of the inadequacy of records reflecting why students are suspended. Although the OCR surveys have been instrumental in drawing attention to the widespread and frequent use of suspension, they do not provide information on the official reasons cited for suspensions.

The 1975 CDF report, School Suspensions, provided the first systematic look behind the act of suspension to determine the behaviors which lead to the use of school suspensions. Because of the inadequacy of school records and of the OCR survey in providing reasons for suspension, the CDF surveyed parents and students in an effort to determine these reasons. The CDF survey found that 63.4 percent of the suspensions were for violations of school rules, and not for dangerous or violent acts.[8]

Since 1975, the Project for the Fair Administration of Student Discipline has conducted detailed analyses of reasons leading to suspension in selected Michigan districts. Because each district has its own policy specifying the offenses that may result in suspension,

we sought a general classification scheme that would permit us to compare the reasons for the suspensions in buildings operating under different policies. The information forming the basis of this analysis was gathered from letters mailed to parents notifying them of the suspension.

Briefly, our classification included four general categories of behavior: attendance violations, law violations, fighting, and discretionary offenses. Under "attendance violations" we categorized all behavioral offenses which relate to attendance, including tardiness, skipping class, unauthorized absences, and truancy.

"Law violations" included all offenses which constitute violations of local ordinances or State and Federal law. Included here are misdemeanors such as use of tobacco, as well as felonies like drug and weapons possession.

Our third category related to offenses involving fighting. Although "fighting" may also be considered as a law violation since it usually involves elements of both assault and battery, we chose to separate fights between students from batteries upon staff and other law violations to determine the extent to which fighting was a reason for suspension.

Our final category, "discretionary offenses," is admittedly the most problematic. Here we attemped to isolate misbehaviors which are of relatively minor seriousness, but because of their definition or nature involve a substantial amount of discretion on the part of staff in identifying a particular behavior as an offense. Common examples of discretionary offenses include insubordination, disrespect, classroom disruption, and misconduct.

Utilizing this classification scheme, we analyzed the reason for suspensions in four schools during the 1974-75 school year. In three of the four schools, attendance violations constituted the most frequently cited category of behavior leading to suspension. Although attendance accounted for suspension in only 10 percent of the cases in one junior high, it accounted for 34 to 45 percent of the suspensions in the other buildings.

The category of fighting represented a significant problem in three of the four schools. Although one school imposed only 10 percent of its suspensions for fighting, the other schools imposed 21, 26, and 29 percent of all their suspensions for fighting.

Law violations were involved in only a relatively small percentage of the suspensions. In none of our schools did law violations constitute the basis of suspension in more than 15 percent of the cases; in one school, law violations represented the reason for suspension in only 8 percent of the cases.

The contribution of discretionary offenses as reasons for suspension varied considerably between districts. In one junior high building, 51 percent of the suspensions were for discretionary offenses; the other junior high cited discretionary offenses in 36 percent of its suspensions. The high schools appeared to suspend less for discretionary offenses, reporting that 19 and 23 percent of their suspensions resulted from this category of offenses.

When the categories of attendance violation and discretionary offenses were merged, at least half of all suspensions were accounted for; in one school, the combination of suspensions for attendance and discretionary offenses accounted for 76 percent of all suspensions. This same general distribution of offenses leading to suspension was found in an analysis of a large midwestern district with some 300 schools enrolling over 240,000 students. The figures bear a striking similarity to the Children's Defense Fund findings based on interviews with parents and suspended students. They also serve to reinforce the contention that suspensions are not utilized to separate students guilty of serious misconduct, but for the most part are used as a response to relatively minor misbehavior on the part of students.

Impact of Suspensions

In theory, suspension is a risk that all students face on an equal basis; in practice, suspension disproportionately impacts upon students with certain visible characteristics. For the past 3 years, we have conducted research in the area of disproportionate minority discipline. In the course of that research we have examined the impact of school discipline, especially suspensions, upon minority students. Our research has revealed that black students are not only more likely to be suspended but are also more likely to be referred than are white students. Although our evidence suggests that minority and majority students have an equal probability of being suspended when they are referred to the office, the disproportionate number of black students referred carries through to the suspension stage, resulting in the observable disproportionality in suspensions.

In addition to the disproportionality in referrals and suspensions, discipline impacts differently on black students in terms of the reasons they are suspended. Our data indicate that black students are more likely to be suspended for discretionary offenses and fighting, while white students are more frequently suspended for attendance and law violations.

In addition to the racial impact of suspensions, there are clear sex and income differences between suspended and non-suspended students. Although school populations are divided almost equally between the sexes in most instances, males are usually suspended at twice the rate of female students.

As indicated by the CDF, children from families receiving AFDC or other public assistance are more likely to be suspended.[9] Our ability to assess the impact of suspension upon students from poor and low-income families is severely limited. However, recently we have analyzed suspensions using information on whether a student receives a free or reduced price lunch as a crude measure of family income. These analyses indicate that both minority and majority students receiving free or reduced price lunches are more likely to be suspended than are other students.[10]

The Consequences of Suspension

The act of suspending a student has immediate and long-range effects which impact directly and indirectly upon the student, the school staff, and the larger community. Obviously, the suspension interrupts the student's instructional program. Since many suspended students are experiencing academic difficulty,[11] the lost instructional time may be pivotal in the student's academic success for the semester. If the school does not permit the student to make up exams and homework, the lost grades may automatically mean that, no matter how good previous or subsequent grades might have been, the student will receive a failing mark. Consequently, the student might not attempt to complete coursework or attend school for the remainder of the semester.

Another consequence of suspension for the student is that he/she may become labeled as a problem by other staff in the school by virtue of having a suspension entered into official school records and knowledge of the suspension circulated among staff. This may have formal as well as informal consequences. Informally, staff members may be quicker to refer the student who has been suspended previously due to some vague perception that he/she is a discipline problem. In a formal sense, a suspension is almost always considered in subsequent disciplinary incidents and usually permits the school to impose a longer suspension. In some situations, the fact that a student has been suspended several times for behavioral problems may set in motion evaluation and placement procedures to have the student diagnosed as emotionally impaired and placed in a special education program.[12]

Suspension also isolates students from an important, structured environment.[13] Although some students may view suspension as a welcome vacation and may consciously manipulate the system to provoke this vacation, to other students it represents the equivalent of solitary confinement. For this latter group of students, school represents a dynamic and important social setting providing a comfortable balance between structured routines and new and exciting experiences. The act of suspension separates these students from an important part of their lives and isolates them from friends.

School suspension also conveys a strong message of personal and institutional rejection and frustration.[14] The fact that the school imposes a suspension conveys a message that the school is frustrated by its inability to deal with the student. The rejection of the student temporarily through suspension raises in the student's mind the issue of whether he/she belongs in school at all. But more importantly, suspension conveys a confusing message about education and its importance. On the one hand, the state has communicated the importance of education by compelling students to attend between the ages of 6 and 16. Similarly, school staffs continually urge students to recognize how vitally important it is to obtain an education. But on the other hand, the schools convey the message that a few days lost here and there to suspension for minor misbehavior are not really that important. I find it difficult to believe that a suspension of 10 days, out of a semester of 90 to 100 instructional days, is so insignificant in the educational life of a student that it can be withheld without substantially affecting the student's educational progress.

Another consequence of suspension is its impact upon a student's notions of justice and fairness. As students observe the imposition of suspension upon others or experience it firsthand, they will inevitably form an impression of school justice. Where students see suspensions arbitrarily imposed for minor misbehavior, staff supported when they are clearly in the wrong, and administrators ignoring clearly established procedures, they certainly cannot form a healthy concept of justice or fairness. Instead they learn to distrust and disrespect authority, they see that people in power are not bound by the rules of fairness and that the real game is to beat the system.

School suspension can also have long-term consequences for the student. Repeated suspensions can prompt a student to decide to leave school to avoid the hassles. Some suggest that a student who is suspended frequently and leaves school is likely to become involved in delinquent activity. There is also evidence to suggest that the record of suspension can damage or limit the student's future educational and employment opportunities, making it more likely that the student may become involved in delinquent activities.

Suspension also has direct consequences for the school. For those teachers who are committed to educating young people, suspension prevents them from accomplishing this goal. This may cause additional frustration and stress for staff members. Additionally, the suspension may be disruptive for the teachers since material the student has missed may call for after-school instruction or may be lost to the student forever if the local district does not permit make-up work or if the student fails to complete the assignments. Additionally, the teacher must be concerned with readjustment of a student returning to school unprepared for the assignment and unaware of the immediately preceding assignments.

The use of suspension can also create a high level of parent and community resentment for the school's failure to meet the needs of students through less intrusive means. This resentment may cause open hostility that results in a refusal of parents to believe or support the schools, not only around issues of discipline, but around more general issues relating to education. At a time when many schools are seeking to more actively involve a broader cross-section of parents in school activities, suspension may have a counterproductive effect.

Suspension also has very direct economic consequences for the school. For schools that receive State aid based on average daily attendance, suspensions may result in a significant loss of State funds. And even for districts that receive State aid based upon a yearly enrollment count, there is a loss in the sense that the schools have structured their instructional program and services for a larger number of students than will actually receive services.

One measure of the cost of using suspensions is the value of educational services withheld from students. In the 51 Michigan districts which participated in the 1972-73 OCR survey, student suspensions exceeded 98,000 school days, or the equivalent of 545 student-years. Given an average per pupil expenditure of over $950.00 for the State during the 1972-73 school year, the value of withheld services exceeded a half-million dollars.[15]

The personal consequences of suspension for the student can also make suspension extremely costly for society. If a student is unable to acquire suitable employment because of his/her school record or because he/she lacks basic skills for entry-level jobs or continuing education, the cost to society is extremely high. Until skills are developed and the record is overcome, society may have to provide public assistance and greater unemployment benefits. Furthermore, we will need increasing numbers of programs in remedial instruction and job training.

Another societal cost involved in suspension may well be increases in juvenile delinquency and ultimately criminal activity. The cost of increases in delinquency can be measured both in terms of increased fear and suffering, as well as increased financial costs for police, courts, detention facilities, and insurance.

Given the potential consequences and costs of suspension for the student, the school, and society, suspension for minor misbehavior is extremely expensive. When all the factors related to the purpose, impact, and consequences of suspension are considered, it is clear, at least in my mind, that we have no realistic choice except to find ways to avoid school suspension as frequently as possible and to reduce its negative impacts and consequences.

THE ALTERNATIVES

In-school alternatives to suspension comprise a wide range of programs and activities which schools use in lieu of suspension. These alternatives include strategies as simple as instituting alternative punishments like paddling and work details, or as complex as separate alternative schools to which suspended students are temporarily or permanently assigned. Although the issue of what in-school alternatives exist will be discussed in depth in a later presentation, I would like to briefly review the general directions in-school alternatives seem to be taking to provide a framework for discussing specific concerns related to them.

The first type of in-school alternative which is gaining some acceptance can be categorized as alternative punishments. Alternative punishments are most commonly thought of as those disciplinary actions which the school uses prior to deciding that a more severe response such as suspension is in order. Typically, these alternatives would include disciplinary actions like corporal punishment, additional academic assignments, work details around the school, and detentions (before school, after school, or during lunch). Even though many educators view these as actions to take prior to suspension and consequently not really alternatives, it is evident that for some students these actions represent an effective deterrent to future misbehavior. The important point to be made about these alternatives is that they must be monitored closely to determine their effectiveness in reducing misbehavior problems with specific students.

Detention centers represent another, although archaic, in-school alternative. These programs detain students in an isolated setting within the school with no books, writing materials, verbal communication, or movement for limited periods of time, usually part of the school day. The obvious problem with this alternative is the deprivation and the waste of time it promotes.

A third type of in-school alternative is in-school study centers, where students report during the term of suspension. Commonly, these centers isolate suspended students from the general student population with a teacher who provides assistance to them in completing assignments provided by regular classroom teachers. Frequently, these programs provide separate break and lunch periods, and restrict participation in extracurricular activities.

A fourth type of alternative is in-school suspension centers, which are similar to study centers in terms of isolating suspended students. But in addition to providing supervised study, these programs frequently include counseling services directed at improving the problems underlying the students' behavior. Some programs of this nature also include special academic services to improve students' academic skills.

A number of schools have also attempted to utilize special counseling programs as alternatives. These programs represent a variety of different counseling approaches, including intensive individual counseling, group counseling, peer counseling, reality therapy, and referrals to outside counseling resources. The programs are sometimes included in combination with other programs, but are also used as separate in-school alternatives.

Some schools are also utilizing behavioral control programs. Typical of these programs are behavioral contracting, token economies, and other behavior modification techniques. Another type of program is actually a combination of various approaches which focus upon the student, teacher, parents, and the school structure in attempting to assemble a variety of strategies which can be drawn on by diagnostic teams to fashion a program response to the problems and needs of students. One such program, the PASS Program in St. Petersburg, Florida, combines preventative programs with remedial interventions to form a comprehensive set of programs to address discipline problems. PASS Programs include activities in staff development, parent training, home and school survival training for students, and a time-out room.

A final type of in-school alternative is the separate alternative school for students with behavioral problems. Frequently, the alternative school services students from the entire district or a sub-area of the district. These programs usually include a staff of administrators, counselors, teachers, and aides. In many cases the students are assigned for extended periods of time, although repeated short-term suspensions may have resulted in their assignment to alternative schools. Generally, this type of alternative is designed to provide remedial instruction, as well as assistance to the students in dealing with the behaviors that led to the assignment. Most of these schools are designed to facilitate re-entry to the regular school after a specified period of time.

CRITICAL QUESTIONS AND ISSUES ABOUT IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES

Although the in-school alternatives discussed above represent a diversified set of approaches, they generate a common set of concerns and issues that are critical to structuring and evaluating such programs. In the following section, a number of critical questions and issues related to in-school alternatives are raised and briefly discussed.

1. What purpose will the alternative serve?

Although the term "in-school alternative to suspension" reflects a generalized intent to utilize such a program in situations where

suspension would normally be imposed, it is still important to focus and delineate very specific statements of the purposes of an in-school alternative. In the discussion of the purposes of short-term suspension, we reviewed some general purposes commonly associated with school suspension. We need to address the question of how well these purposes will be met. For example, how will parents be involved, how will students learn the lessons of living in a free society, etc.?

In some cases, the alternatives will meet none of the purposes served by suspension, but instead will generate a new set of purposes which may be divergent from those underlying suspension. It may become clearer as these issues are addressed that the purposes served by suspension bear no desirable relationship to those formulated for alternatives. Consequently, it is necessary to analyze the purposes of alternatives along a number of different dimensions.

A corollary issue involves whether the alternatives will deal only with students encountering difficulties with specific behaviors or with any student who is suspended, regardless of the behavior. It is obvious, at least to some, that what we term discipline problems is simply a catchall term for a wide variety of problems. Underlying the concept of discipline problems are a number of different behaviors requiring various approaches. In structuring alternatives, schools should decide what types of behaviors can realistically be addressed by the proposed alternative.

2. How does the in-school alternative, implicitly or explicitly, define the source(s) of the problem it will address?

A central issue which should be considered in structuring in-school alternatives is defining the source and nature of problems which contribute to the need for alternatives. With few exceptions, the existing alternatives implicitly define the student as the source of the problem. To some extent this is understandable since alternatives usually assume that the student is guilty of misconduct; alternatives are thereby merely the means of avoiding the suspension. In a significant number of instances this may be the case. However, it is equally clear that students are not the sole source of discipline problems; teachers, administrators, and other staff must share responsibility for the state of discipline and must also be responsible for making personal and institutional changes to improve their behavior.

Teachers must recognize that, while many societal factors are responsible for the deterioration of discipline, teachers are not without responsibility. Our evidence indicates that the vast majority of referrals originate from the classroom and are the result of minor conflicts between the teacher and student. Additionally, it is my contention that teachers' unions, the collective bargaining ap-

proaches, and individual teaching practices are strongly implicated in the current discipline crisis. As teachers have fought to gain a reasonable level of control within their professional domain, they have bargained on issues related to eliminating non-instructional assignments and supervision of extracurricular activities without pay. Their success in achieving equitable pay and assignments, especially with the financial crises of the '70s, has meant the surrender of many avenues of informal contact with students. It is my belief, admittedly unsupported by evidence, that it is these informal contacts, and the bonds and understanding that are created through them, that in the past gained for the teacher a reservoir of respect from students that could be called upon to prevent and correct problems of minor misbehavior.

For their part, administrators must bear some responsibility for the content of rules, as well as for the outcome of their decision-making processes leading to suspension. Even in light of the Supreme Court decision in Goss vs. Lopez, requiring an informal hearing before suspension, little has been accomplished toward making the suspension decision any more than a pro forma ceremony. Some evidence suggests that administrators may do little by way of independent decision-making in the discipline process. In one school that we studied, the building administrators received almost 1,100 separate referrals in a school year. In 97 percent of these referrals, the administrators found the students guilty of the misbehavior. In that same school, however, students presented a very different picture through their responses to the charges. While over 45 percent of the students admitted guilt, 33 percent of the students denied being guilty of the misbehavior.

The purpose of this digression is not to place blame for the facile use of suspension on specific role groups in the school, but to illustrate that not all the problems related to out-of-school suspension are students' problems. Consequently, alternatives to suspension should address the discipline problems of a variety of role groups in the school that must share responsibility for the existence of and solutions for discipline problems.

3. How will the effectiveness of the in-school alternative be assessed?

The evaluation of in-school alternatives presents a number of complicated problems. On one level, in-school alternatives can be evaluated in terms of a decrease in both the total number of suspensions imposed and the days of instructional time lost. But on another and perhaps more important level, alternatives should be evaluated in terms of whether they effect a decrease in the incidence of the behaviors which lead to suspension. Is it acceptable to simply decrease suspensions and lost instructional days without effecting a decline in the incidence of problem behaviors?

Another issue involving evaluation is whether schools will evaluate the effectiveness of the programs only in terms of their aggregate impacts, or will they attempt to include an evaluative dimension which focuses upon the effectiveness of the programs for individual students in decreasing their suspensions, lost instructional days, and referrals for misbehavior. It appears to us that one of the current shortcomings of school suspensions and other disciplinary actions is the failure of schools to carefully monitor their impact and effectiveness for individuals as well as groups of students. In structuring alternatives, schools should attempt to structure evaluations so that administrators and teachers have a better sense of what is effective for various students.

4. Does the alternative permit and support the student in maintaining academic progress substantially equivalent to the regular school program?

Since in-school alternatives to suspension reflect significant concerns about the impact of suspension on students' learning, a central issue in structuring alternatives is whether they provide an opportunity for students to make academic progress substantially equivalent to what they would make if they were not assigned to an in-school alternative. Obviously, most of the alternatives, because of their staffing and resources, are not able to array the instructional services that are provided in the regular program by several teachers with specialized training in their respective subject areas. Nevertheless, these alternatives must be structured to provide academic instruction that will permit students to keep up with their school work and minimize the educational loss occasioned by assignment to an alternative. While it is not always possible to structure alternatives to permit students to make substantially equivalent academic progress, it should remain the goal of each alternative program to maintain or improve the academic standing of the students.

A related issue is to what extent students in the alternatives will be provided with remedial services. Although there is little evidence to determine whether academic problems cause disciplinary problems or discipline problems cause academic problems, there is evidence that the two are strongly correlated. Since this is the case, careful consideration should be given to structuring alternatives to diagnose academic problems and establish more long-term plans for remediation. Although little can be done in remediating academic deficiencies during a 1- to 10-day assignment to an alternative, such an assignment does provide enough time to begin reviewing students' academic standing and developing diagnostic/prescriptive work-ups which would provide a plan that could be followed up by classroom teachers and specialized personnel.

5. How will the alternative program address the behavior problem(s) (both structural and student centered) leading to students' assignment there?

If alternatives are to be anything more than our new "revolving doors" of student discipline, then the underlying causes of problems must be identified and addressed, either through the alternative itself or through other mechanisms. Simply establishing in-school alternatives will do little to alter the circumstances which lead to students' assignment there. If suspension has taught us any useful lessons, certainly an important one is that responses which simply move students from one setting to another, without any attempt to facilitate change in the students, staff, or structure, will mean that 5 years down the road we will be looking for alternatives to in-school alternatives. In the meantime, we will have lost more students than we can afford to lose.

In-school alternatives must be clearly established techniques and processes for addressing the problems which lead to suspension and placement in alternatives. As indicated above, in some instances, students, staff, and the structure will all be implicated as sources of the problem. The critical questions are whether the organization and the adults who are charged with its operation admit their culpability as readily as they have assigned responsibility to students, and more important, whether they are willing and able to undertake the needed personal and institutional changes.

It has been argued that previous approaches to innovative programs in the schools have failed to take into account that the school itself is an organization. In-school alternatives which focus on what are thought to be individual behavioral problems ignore the roles played by all sectors of the organization in generating significant levels of problems. In-school alternatives to suspension provide an opportunity for innovative responses that take the organization and all of its participants into account. Without the active participation and acceptance of responsibility on the part of all interested parties, we will be no further ahead with in-school alternatives than we are now with the extensive and unthoughtful use of suspension.

6. What legal issues might arise in the operation of an in-school alternative?

Since in-school alternatives are of recent origin, they have not been subjected to the legal scrutiny received by the practice of suspension. Nevertheless, alternatives may raise a number of legal concerns. Below is a brief discussion of the basic legal issues associated with in-school alternatives.

Procedural Due Process. Many administrators find in-school alternatives attractive because there is no clear requirement that a student be given a hearing to determine whether he/she should be placed in the alternative. In many cases this belief may be based on a misperception since, in order for the student to be placed in the alternative, he or she must be eligible for suspension. Since the 1975 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in Goss vs. Lopez, the public schools have been required to provide a hearing prior to suspension, unless an emergency exists. To the extent that this hearing is provided and in-school alternatives are offered as a voluntary option in lieu of suspension, at least the minimum due process protections have been provided.

But concerns with due process protections do not and should not end here. Certainly if there are not grounds for suspension and if the student is involuntarily placed in an alternative program, an argument can be made for the necessity of due process protections because of the property and liberty interests at stake. In reviewing the practice of short-term suspension, the U.S. Supreme Court stated:

> Neither the property interest in educational benefits temporarily denied nor the liberty interest in reputation, which is also implicated, is so insubstantial that suspension may constitutionally be imposed by any procedure the school chooses, no matter how arbitrary.

Although reassignment to an in-school alternative does not necessarily result in a denial of access to the school, it certainly bears upon a student's reputation and arguably may require the application of due process protections.

More recently, Congress has established the need for the application of due process to special education placement decisions through the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. Congress has also applied due process protections to the area of student records by requiring a hearing on record disputes. Taken together, the legislative decisions represent a growing trend toward protecting students and parents from arbitrary decisionmaking through the requirement that important decisions be accompanied by procedural protections which adequately protect their interests. In developing procedures for placement in alternatives, schools should establish due process protections.

Informed Consent. The doctrine of informed consent is based on the theory that every person has a right to know what is to happen to his/her own body and a right to participate in decisions affecting it. Informed consent involves elements of due process as well as privacy. In the context of programs serving minors, the parents must be looked to for the provision of consent. While no precise parameters exist for determining what types of school program or activities should

prompt the use of informed parental consent, certainly the extent to which the programs involve evaluation, diagnosis, and "non-academic treatments" should be the determining factor in obtaining approval from parents.

Informed parental consent for placements in programs may be accomplished through a provision in the hearing procedures that parents be fully informed of the information relevant to a choice. Typically, the information necessary for parents to make an informed decision would include descriptions of the problems leading to the decision to seek placement, the contemplated program, the risks involved in the program (academic, psychological, or physical), the prospects for success, the consequences of refusal to provide consent, and alternatives available to the student and parents, as well as a state- ment that parents are not required to give consent and may withdraw at any point in time.

Different types of in-school alternatives, because of their nature and content, will raise varying levels of concern for obtaining informed parental consent. While there may be legal requirements for informed consent for some programs, especially those involving coercive behavior control techniques, schools should uniformly attempt to gain parental consent and support prior to utilizing in-school alternatives, regardless of their nature.

Segregation of Minority Group Students. Given the data on the disproportionate impact of discipline upon minority group students, schools should also give careful consideration to the possibility that the establishment of in-school alternatives may result in programs which enroll primarily minority group students and tend to segregate and isolate minority group students. In some situations, the disproportionate disciplinary involvement of minority group students has led to programs which white students identify as "minority programs," and consequently they choose to serve an out-of-school suspension rather than receive assignment to programs where they may constitute the minority. In one Michigan school district which maintains a separate facility for students while under suspension, not a single white student accepted assignment to the program during the 1975-76 school year. In another district with a minority enrollment of only 14 percent, the minority enrollment in a separate behavioral alternative setting has consistently exceeded 80 percent.

DIRECTIONS FOR IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES AND STUDENT DISCIPLINE

Assessing what directions the schools should be taking in the area of in-school alternatives and student discipline is undoubtedly a laborious task. To some extent we are all severely limited by the lack of readily available information on what schools around the

country are currently doing and what has proven successful. In this final section, I would like to suggest some directions which seem critical given my understanding of the problems we face with suspension and discipline.

Broadening the Perspective on In-School Alternatives

As indicated previously, I view the emergence of in-school alternatives with guarded optimism. They can be useful if we plan and monitor them in a manner that will prevent them from becoming as casually utilized and mismanaged as suspension. But beyond the issue of careful management, the range of what is considered an in-school alternative should be substantially broadened.

First, we need to begin seeking a wider range of in-school alternatives. In-school alternatives should not be viewed solely in terms of new or novel ways of handling student suspension without removing the student. Alternatives must focus upon prevention and correction of discipline problems and remediation of academic problems. If we are to solve discipline problems, we must simultaneously focus not only on how schools respond to misbehavior, but on how to prevent and correct it.

In broadening the range of alternatives, schools must also move toward a model of comprehensive alternatives. No single alternative can realistically address the wide range of misbehaviors that lead to suspension or the variety of students' needs which underlie these problems. Furthermore, it is evident that students are not the sole source of problems leading to the high incidence of suspension. These circumstances call for the schools to establish a variety of alternatives to match the diversity of problems that the schools face. Once a school has selected the range of alternatives it wishes to use, they should be reviewed collectively to determine the extent to which they represent a comprehensive set of strategies which reflect the needs of students and the school.

Second, in-school alternatives must stop placing all the blame for problems upon the shoulders of students. We should begin to look closely at the structure of schools, as well as at how adults in the setting behave, to determine what alternatives can be established to correct the problems of the organization and the adults who maintain it.

And finally, we must cease to use finances as an excuse for inaction. Everyone recognizes the severe financial limitations that most school districts face and the restraints they place upon the schools' capability for maintaining staff and resources for in-school alternatives. But the crises of school discipline and suspension call for drastic and immediate action. If discipline and alternatives call

for the temporary diversion of resources, then we must make those sacrifices. It makes little sense to continue to operate our schools as if the problems were minor.

Future Directions for Student Discipline

The emerging in-school alternatives to suspension certainly can be justified on the basis of the personal, economic, and societal costs attendant to suspension. They represent a critical element of any school's attempts to more effectively manage and respond to problems of student behavior. Administrators, teachers, students, and parents should all lend assistance to the development of these alternatives. While the current range of alternatives forms a crucial aspect of discipline for the future, they are only part of the work that must be accomplished if we are to effectively reduce discipline problems. The larger task which faces schools and communities involves a drastic restructuring of school discipline to meet the needs of the schools, the students, and the society of the future.

The most critical need in the area of student discipline is to begin a long-overdue rethinking of discipline. Even with all the recent concern over problems of discipline, discipline structures and approaches continue to exist on the principles established during times when the society, the schools, the staff, and the students were all drastically different. A 19th century model for student discipline cannot serve the needs of a 20th century society.

Before closing, I would like to offer my notions of some basic recommendations for restructuring student discipline. First, schools must give student discipline more than a verbal priority. Schools must commit resources to assessing their discipline problems and developing realistic structures to facilitate the accomplishment of their goals. In the process of developing goals and structures of discipline, the schools must involve parents and students.

Second, schools should spend more time teaching students the bounds of conduct. The approach of most schools in teaching conduct and discipline has puzzled me for some time. When schools undertake to teach students other subject matter, such as English or math, they develop instructional materials, objectives, lesson plans, and methods of evaluating the learning that has occurred. But when it comes to teaching students about behavior and discipline, the schools do little beyond handing students a discipline code. No parent or educator would accept a school's decision to teach English or math by handing students textbooks and then holding them responsible for learning. We have now reached the point in the schools where it should be equally unacceptable to place the burden of learning discipline solely upon the student.

We need to teach students what the rules are, why they are, and how they are enforced. At the same time, we need to begin to teach students and staff how to manage situations of conflict productively. If neither students nor staff have skills in the methods of conflict management and resolution, students will continue to react to conflict situations through fighting and defiance of school rules, and school staff will continue attempting to manage conflict by labeling the manifestations of conflict as various types of misbehavior.

Third, teachers and administrators must be provided with comprehensive skills in designing discipline systems and managing discipline problems. One or two courses in classroom management is not sufficient to provide the understanding and skills necessary for effective management of student discipline. Through in-service and pre-service training, school staffs must gain skill in managing the range of social behaviors prevalent in our schools. Boards of education and institutions of higher education must give development of training for educators their highest priority.

And finally, we must actively involve students, parents, school staff, and the community in the planning and decisionmaking related to student discipline. Discipline is everyone's problem and responsibility. No one role group in the school can effectively plan and carry out the discipline goals and practices of a school. It is too large and too complex a task. Hopefully, by utilizing broad-based community and school alliances, we can bring collective sanity to an otherwise insane situation.

I hope that through the 2 days of this conference, we can begin to establish this collective sanity that is desperately needed, not only for the benefit of students, but for the benefit of all.

REFERENCES

[1]Children's Defense Fund, "School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children," (Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund, 1975), p. 10.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

[4]See generally Goss vs. Lopez, 419 U.S. 565, 95 S. Ct. 729 (1975).

[5]"School Suspensions," supra., p. 6.

[6]C. Yorkievitz, M. Flynn, and J. Williams, "Assessing Disproportionate Minority Discipline: An Examination of a Recently Desegregated Middle School," (unpublished report of the Project for Fair

Administration of Student Discipline, University of Michigan School of Education, 1978), pp. 60-61.

[7]Project for Fair Administration of Student Discipline, "Phase I Report," (unpublished report of Project for Fair Administration of Student Discipline, University of Michigan School of Education, 1975), p. 25.

[8]"School Suspensions," supra, p. 37.

[9]Ibid., p. 61.

[10]C. Yorkievitz and M. Flynn, "Characteristics of Suspended Students," (unpublished report of the Project for Fair Administration of Student Discipline, University of Michigan School of Education, 1977), pp. 16-17.

[11]Stephen Rollins, "The Governor's Task Force on Disruptive Youth," Student Discipline: Policies, Programs, and Procedures, eds. C. Moody, C. Vergon, and J. Williams, (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1978) p. 60.

[12]Both the suspension statute and special education regulations for the State of Michigan support this conclusion. See M.C.L.A. Sec. 340.613 and M.C.L.A. Sec. R34.1706.

[13]See generally "School Suspensions," supra, and Thomas Cottle, Barred from School: Two Million Children (Washington, D.C.: New Republic Book Company, Inc., 1976).

[14]Ibid.

[15]C. Vergon and J. Williams, "School Suspension Practices in Michigan: A Preliminary Accounting," Student Discipline: Policies, Programs, and Procedures, supra, p. 69.

SESSION I

DISCUSSION OF IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION: WHY BOTHER?

Richard Green, Ph.D.
Irwin A. Hyman, Ed.D.

COMMENTS OF DR. GREEN

Good evening. One measure of the productivity of any conference is what you can learn from other people who are also in attendance. I submit to you that there is very little that I can say from this podium which will be half as important as what the person sitting next to you can offer. Take some time to meet that person when this session concludes.

The theme of Mr. Williams' paper -- "In-School Alternatives to Suspension: Why Bother" -- raises a very serious question about what is happening in public education. For me this question involves not suspension or discipline per se, but rather the art of learning and teaching responsibility versus the function of discipline and authority in public institutions.

I could present to you today many plans for alternatives ranging from in-school alternatives to street academies to private schools. But I think we would inevitably come back to focus on our expectations on learning and on the role of teaching. As we begin to consider the dimensions of the problem, we may be forced to ask ourselves whether we can really do any better; we must also question whether we are really serving that "common good" which schools are designed to further.

The issues of in-school suspension, discipline, and order are not unrelated to the issue of power in this country. Neither are they unrelated to racism and classism in society. On a day-to-day basis, I urge principals to examine their attitudes, to think about strategies, to look at the issue of racism, to talk about children's rights, students' rights, and parents' rights, and to examine the fact that those in the higher economic strata tend to get more satisfaction from educational resources. Even though we have done this in our schools, the need for suspension as a disciplinary vehicle has increased rather than diminished.

What we must finally consider, then, is this: Can we really, in a society such as ours, perform in ways that differ from those of the present? I am not certain that we have determined how we can really serve the "common good." Mr. Williams talked about the need for a variety of alternatives in times of change. I say to you that every

school district that is experiencing declining enrollment, the closing of facilities, desegregation, aging staff, and budget cuts because of inflation has very few resources for the implementation of a wide range of alternatives to suspension. The powers that be, that is, political forces, administrators, teachers, unions, and education associations, which opt for salary, working conditions, and supplies, do not support economically the kind of planning and research which allows the flexibility to look into alternative approaches to the issue. Unless Federal dollars support the effort, little innovation will be achieved.

There is something inhumane about the fact that we can guarantee literacy only for some individuals in the school system; all are entitled, but many fail. This is one of the issues which needs to be raised. And before you talk about specific in-house strategies which deal with suspension or expulsion, you have to address who the system most successfully serves and why.

I submit to you that those are key concepts we all must consider, but I also believe that this conference will serve an important function. Because of social and technological changes, education has had to reform in more responsive and valid ways. Back in the '50s, Russia's Sputnik made us reform our curriculum. In the '60s, racism and civil rights caused us to look differently at the way we educated children with diverse ethnic and racial backgrounds. I suspect too that the issue of suspension will help change our perspective on how authority can be translated into the teaching and learning experience. And for that reason, this conference will serve as an excellent starting point for reform, and the planning we will have to endure will be healthy, although painful and demanding.

Nevertheless, I think a key question that policymakers at the local level here today must answer is: What role should authority play in the interrelationships between teachers and students? A second question that has to be raised is: What are the rights of the child versus those of another child? Historically, the rights of one child in a classroom situation have not outweighed those of his fellow pupils. Therefore, that individual has been cited as the problem, and thus negatively labeled by the school system.

Another key question that results from these concerns focuses on process. In our school district (Minneapolis, Minnesota), we have a new mode of getting parents involved in discipline. We have discipline policies which are developed by parent groups at the building level, agreed to by the teaching staff, and ratified in writing. These policies and procedures lay out not only the due process requirements in discipline circumstances, but also what the school district and teachers are obliged to do in responding to the needs of children.

The process has helped Minneapolis, especially by raising levels of consciousness. Parents are more informed, and many know how to use the system. But in spite of all this, we still have a disproportionate number of minority suspensions. This fact forces me to ask my principals what is really the origin of the problems. For before one can talk about solutions, one must gain an insight into the nature of the difficulty.

Many schools and educators encounter problems through attempting on their own to enforce rigid rules. They establish the regulations, and they alone are deemed responsible for enforcing the learning environment. There is no trade-off in terms of negotiating the rights of students or parents in that kind of environment. What is needed is "shared responsibility," which increases involvement on the part of the entire school community and leads to commitment.

In addition, we must ask ourselves a series of other pertinent questions. Can suspension serve any useful purpose in the learning process? Has such a purpose ever been documented? How does suspension affect learning? Does suspension really set in motion a self-fulfilling prophecy of the failure? Further, we must ask how can we know whether any of the successful in-school models that we will examine over the next few days will really have an immediate impact on lessening the potential for failure.

I raise the question about in-school suspension because it is strongly supported by those who want to work with students through peer counseling, peer student groups, and self-initiatives that are designed to make students feel good about themselves. These educators talk about the affective dimension because they know that it works.

We have evidence that affective approaches reduce attendance loss and allow an escape from conformity. Affective approaches permit the system to be flexible in allocating some of its resources from program development, but outcomes are very short-range and undocumented. So for those of you who are moving in the direction of in-school suspensions, it would seem to me that the National Institute of Education and other research organizations could propose the kinds of criteria necessary for determining what kind of impact such strategies have on the achievement levels of children.

The voice of discipline is certainly one to which I believe we must all listen. When students misbehave, they may be trying to articulate a concern to us. Even more, when institutions speak out in terms of discipline as they have in this country over the past 3 years, another voice is saying help is needed. It is my belief that only when and if the allocation of resources moves forward through a cross-section of policymaking "thinkers" in step with practitioners can we make a difference in addressing the concept and practice of in-school suspension and its role in education.

COMMENTS OF DR. HYMAN

Before making comments on specific points in Mr. Williams' excellent presentation, I would like to react to the theme of this conference, which is reflected in his paper. The topic of this conference and the title of Mr. Williams' paper suggest a certain "Zeitgeist" which has forced education into a defensive posture when dealing with problems of school discipline. Without tracing the predictable etiology of the current conservative public sentiment, it is obvious that economic forces play an important role. Education is one of the few arenas in which an overtaxed public may have a direct effect on the outflow of dollars. The "back to basics" movement has provided the "get tough" element in our society with a comfortable forum to "get into the act." The yearly Gallup polls indicating the public's concern with school discipline may be less a reflection of increasing discipline problems than an expression of a general conservative swing in all areas which relate to the interface between public funds and public services. Thus, in the mid-seventies we hold a conference on "alternatives," a word which suggests a particular defensiveness. Why is this?

Historically, the sixties was a decade of fomentation and new approaches to solving social problems. In contrast, the seventies might be considered the decade of the return to punitiveness in the solution of social problems. In the sixties, we were concerned with student and civil rights in education, improving the plight of the poor, and rehabilitating criminals. In the seventies, public sentiment and economic resources suggest a reduction in the trend toward recognizing students as citizens, a slowdown in the plans to push for equal educational opportunity, cutbacks in programs for the poor without the long-awaited reforms of the welfare system, and, finally, the alarming return to punitiveness in criminology. Of special concern is the decision one year ago by the majority of the Supreme Court to deny school children constitutional protection from paddling.

This current punitive milieu is reflected in the title of the conference, which highlights alternatives rather than prevention. Even the title of Mr. Williams' speech suggests a tongue-in-cheek response of "why bother" with in-school alternatives to suspension. This is not to criticize the conference organizers, however, since the name of the center for which I am director includes the title of alternatives to another punitive method of school discipline. We, the participants in the conference, are victims of the punitive seventies as we go about our work of trying to humanize education. Let no one be misled. Punitiveness is a practice near and dear to the heart of the Puritan ethic of our society. In child rearing and education, the Judeo-Christian tradition is often used to support the "spare the rod" concept that punishment is important for character development. However, while we must keep this in mind as we attend to the exciting

program before us, it is appropriate for me to now turn directly to the keynote presentation.

In commenting on specific points made by Mr. Williams, I will attempt wherever possible to provide additional and/or comparable data which have been generated at the National Center for the Study of Corporal Punishment and Alternatives in the Schools. As I read Mr. Williams' speech, I realized the similarity of our efforts primarily because corporal punishment and suspensions are merely different faces of the specter of punishment which has plagued education in Western society. I am in agreement with the speaker that we must develop an adequate data base in order to deal with a subject that so directly taps the emotional wellsprings of so many Americans.

In the introduction, Mr. Williams mentioned the importance of addressing "the underlying problems which lead to the high use of suspension." In our studies at the Center, we have discovered that too many educators are cursed with an amazingly impoverished repertoire of techniques for preventing and managing school alienation among students and consequent discipline problems. I do not have equivalent data on suspensions, but surveys reveal that, while most educators favor the retention of the use of corporal punishment, they also express the need to learn more effective disciplinary techniques (Hyman, McDowell, and Raines, 1977). However, when schools are denied the use of corporal punishment, the most frequently used disciplinary measure is suspension. This has been documented in a recently completed study soon to be published in Inequality by the Center for Law and Education at Cambridge (Farley, et al., 1978). Telephone interviews were conducted with top administrators in 33 school districts which were identified from a list of over 50 as having eliminated corporal punishment within the last 10 years. The respondents averaged three commonly used alternatives to corporal punishment. Suspension led the list and was used by 69 percent of the school systems. Thirty-six percent mentioned parent conferences, 29 percent preventative measures, and 25 percent mentioned detention. Other disciplinary measures included chores, students' rights and responsibility committees, expulsion, and behavior modification.

Mr. Williams notes in his paper that suspensions are "for the most part used as a response to relatively minor misbehavior on the part of students." Our data at the Center suggest that most teachers who are inept in school discipline have inadequate or inappropriate attitudes and have had little or no training in classroom management and conflict resolution. We are currently developing two surveys which address this issue. In one we hope to collect data from a large sample concerning pre- and in-service training regarding discipline. In the other we will gather information from a national sample concerning typical methods of handling discipline problems. This is an extension of our phone survey and uses a "critical incidents" approach.

Moreover, as part of our in-service training program, we have developed a series of video-taped vignettes of typical discipline problems in the classroom. They were written by students and teachers and are used to train teachers to increase their repertoire of techniques for handling common problems. Reflecting Mr. Williams' comments, we have found a wide variety and level of responses by teachers to "relatively minor misbehaviors." We have also discovered that the work of Jacob Kounin (1970) is very helpful for training in classroom management, and we have developed a training package based on his work (Hyman, 1978; Marino, 1975). Finally, the current issue of Today's Education contains an article which more extensively describes my own conceptualization of this issue (Hyman, 1978).

In talking about the purposes of suspension, Williams points out that there is little "systematic study of the effectiveness of various disciplinary measures." This is true in terms of evaluation research of school-based punishments. In approaching the problem at the Center, we turned to the research on punishment. An extensive review of both animal and human studies allowed us to develop a paradigm for the effective use of corporal punishment in the schools (Bongiovanni, 1977). At first glance some were alarmed that we were prescribing a way to punish students effectively, but it is apparent to all but the most hard-core sadist that the prescription is antithetical to the functioning of an open school system in a democratic society. Further, it would be foolish to say that punishment does not work, since everyday experience suggests it does. The key point is that punishment works as a short-term suppressor of behavior in most cases, and research shows that reward is much more effective in shaping behavior over long periods. It is unfortunate but wise that Williams includes in his presentation the statement "that for some students...(alternative punishments)...represent an effective deterrent to future misbehavior." While I support the use of rewards and programs to develop internalized control (Hyman, 1964), as a scientist I cannot let my philosophical bias color personal statements of fact. However, Williams' data, as well as our clinical impressions at the Center, suggest that both corporal punishment and suspensions are frequently readministered with little effect on the same recipients.

In discussing the impact of suspensions, Williams raises the issue of racial bias. Our data at the Center and previous studies (Hyman, McDowell, and Raines, 1977) indicate that both corporal punishment and suspensions are administered disproportionately to blacks. We also find Hispanic students receiving disproportionate amounts of corporal punishment as compared to whites. In order to gather this information, we examined a random sample of returns in Region III of the Office for Civil Rights 1975-76 school survey of suspensions. Using appropriate statistical procedures, we found significant differences (Glackman, et al., 1978) in the administration of these punitive procedures to minority students. While we have not

completed the analysis of suspensions, we find that the range of reported use of corporal punishment is quite large. On the average, 1 out of 17 children was corporally punished, but the ratio among minorities was 4 to 1. Most striking, however, were the large differences between schools. One elementary school, for instance, reported 205 incidents of corporal punishment for a student population of 375 children, while another reported only 2 incidents for 550 students. Williams' data add greatly to the Office for Civil Rights findings when he reveals that:

> Blacks are more likely to be suspended for discretionary offenses and fighting, while whites are more frequently suspended for attendance and law violations.

This may be added to our data, which suggest interschool differences in punitiveness. While conducting a social science investigation of the Supreme Court ruling on paddling, we found a mild positive correlation of .23 between reports of paddling and suspensions in the Office for Civil Rights data.

Now I do realize the limitation of the data generated by both Williams and our Center, but it is intriguing to speculate on their meaning. I would guess that corporal punishment and suspensions are not really used in place of each other, but are rather opposite sides of the same coin. Schools appear to have different punitive atmospheres which, when interacting with race, result in high punitive rates for minority students. There has been enough research to show that this can be turned around (Sanders and Yarbrough, 1976; Hyman, Bongiovanni, McDowell, and Friedman, 1977), so I cannot support the assumption that minorities naturally act worse in school and are therefore the recipients of more punishment. Williams' findings go a step further in suggesting that some educators do not care if blacks are tardy or absent, but they do care if blacks break minor rules. These findings indicate a need for much research on teacher stress and attitudes as a cause of punitiveness.

In discussing the consequences of suspensions, Williams presents a number of salient issues. Just to add a better theoretical flavor I would summarize by mentioning the use of suspensions in promoting the "self-fulfilling prophecy" in teacher-student interactions so that frequently suspended students are treated as "bad" and therefore begin to act "bad." Also, frequent suspensions promote "external locus of control" orientations, often reinforcing already developed feelings of helplessness and loss of control at the hands of authorities. This may often result in elicited aggression against school property. And it is important to remember that these children will eventually be taxpayers voting on school budgets.

In his second section on "alternatives," Mr. Williams presents an excellent summary of various approaches. I would like to reinforce

the concept that many of the alternatives are other forms of punishment -- whereas we should not forget the preventative approach. At the Center, we view prevention by analyzing five factors which seem to determine the nature and extent of disciplinary procedures. The factors are: (1) teacher-student personality interactions; (2) teacher and school repertoire of techniques; (3) educators' understanding and belief system of motivation for learning; (4) school climate; and (5) individual students' past history of discipline in both home and school. There is no single best alternative, and each situation must therefore be diagnosed in a manner suggested by Williams in his description of the PASS Program in St. Petersburg, Florida. As he suggests, "The underlying causes of problems must be identified and addressed, either through the alternative itself or through other mechanisms." In understanding and analyzing these underlying causes, I would like to suggest the use of a little-used resource -- the well-trained school psychologist.

References

Bongiovanni, A. A review on the effects of punishment: Implications for corporal punishment in the schools. In J. Wise (Ed.) Proceedings: Corporal punishment in the schools: A national debate. National Institute of Education, 1977 (NIEP-77-0079).

Hyman, I., McDowell, E., and Raines, B. Corporal punishment and alternatives in the schools: An overview of theoretical and practical issues. In J. Wise (Ed.) Proceedings: Corporal punishment in the schools: A national debate. National Institute of Education, 1977 (NIEP-77-0079).

Farley, A., Kreutter, K., Russell, R., Blackwell, S., Finkelstein, H., and Hyman, I. The effects of eliminating corporal punishment in schools: A preliminary survey. Inequality, published by the Center for Law and Education, Cambridge, Mass., 1978.

Glackman, R., Martin, R., Hyman, I., McDowell, E., Berv, V., and Spino, P. Corporal punishment in the schools as it relates to race, sex, grade level and suspensions. Inequality, published by the Center for Law and Education, Cambridge, Mass., 1978.

Hyman, I. Is the hickory stick out of tune. Today's Education, April-May 1978, pp. 30-32.

Hyman, I. Some effects of teaching style on pupil behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1964.

Hyman, I., Bongiovanni, A., McDowell, E., and Friedman, R. Paddling, punishing and force. Children Today, 1977, Vol. 6, No. 5, pp. 17-25.

Kounin, J. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Marino, M. The effectiveness of teacher-centered versus case-centered consultation in the reduction of classroom management. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1975.

Sanders, S. G., and Yarbrough, J. S. Bringing order to an inner city school. Phi Delta Kappan, 1976, (4), pp. 333-334.

SESSION I

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MR. LOHMAN: My name is Bob Lohman and I am an educational psychologist at the College of William & Mary and a member of the American Psychiatric Association Task Force on Schools.

I would like to ask you, Mr. Williams, whether you really were speaking with tongue in cheek when you said, "In-school alternatives -- why bother?" I am wondering primarily why you did not discuss alternatives such as lawyer advocacy, since you stated that 75 percent of the suspension problems involve either attendance -- which might suggest something inherently wrong in our schools -- or discretionary areas.

MR. WILLIAMS: First, let me indicate that the title of my presentation was determined by the NIE staff. In preparing the presentation, I intended to approach the issue of "why bother" in a very serious manner. I am thoroughly convinced that, at least as an interim measure, we need seriously to examine in-school alternatives as one of many possible avenues for reducing the impact of suspension upon students.

But I would also agree with your statement that in-school alternatives do not comprehensively address the nature of problems giving rise to what I have categorized as an excessively high level of suspension. We need to focus upon a number of factors relating to the structure and operation of discipline; we need such things as State legislation that more clearly specifies the reasons for which students may be suspended. For instance, in Michigan, the State statute authorizing the use of suspension cites only gross misdemeanor and persistent disobedience as grounds for suspension. Certainly, this language is extremely vague and gives local boards and administrators an inordinate amount of discretion in determining the specific offenses for which suspension can be imposed. So this vague language predictably results in a great degree of variability in the reasons leading to suspension.

Regarding your point on advocacy, I share your belief that this can be a useful tool in addressing problems related to suspension, since I began my work in student discipline as part of a community-based advocacy group. At the same time, however, we must recognize that case-advocacy may also have limitations. One problem involved in this approach is that it provides only selective, temporary relief. While I was at the Saginaw Student Rights Center, we observed that administrators fairly quickly developed a sense of which pupils were likely to use or had previously used our services and which parents

were good advocates. Over time this sensitivity resulted in more adequate treatment of the groups of students they noticed this way, but for the most part the school continued with business as usual for the vast majority of children.

On a more general level, I would like to reiterate that what appears to be needed is not a single, foolproof approach, but a combination of strategies and approaches which realistically addresses the wide array of problems leading to the high level of suspension in the nation's public schools.

MR. HOOPER: My name is Michael Hooper, and I am the administrator of an alternative school and of alternative classes in various settings. I am really not asking a question; rather, I would like to bring up two major issues.

First, I am concerned about different kinds of alternative suspensions in different parts of the nation; that is, I am curious about whether a program that is practical in one city or community will work well in a very dissimilar location.

Second, I am very interested in the network of communication that will take place within this group tonight and during the next two sessions, as well as that which will exist later. As you indicated, there are probably nine zillion tons of information and expertise in this particular room, and it will be very difficult for each of us to get it all.

DR. GARIBALDI: In terms of communication, we are going to attempt to facilitate something after the conference, primarily through proceedings. For now, I can only say that hopefully everyone in the audience tonight, as well as the many more people who are coming later, will seek each other out and that this conference will not be a cold experience.

Certainly, one thing we can do is get the name of every individual who is present at the confernce; but if we should decide to disseminate such a list, each person on it would have to give his or her consent.

Again, I agree that the issue of communication is certainly crucial.

MR. TURNER: I am Winston Turner from the National Association of Elementary School Principals. I notice that on your panel for Tuesday, the elementary school principals are not represented at all. I raised this question with a gentleman in the back, and he said the omission was made because there are not a lot of problems on the elementary level. If that is the case, then it seems to me that the

elementary principals ought to be represented just to give you some alternatives.

I happen personally not to agree that problems do not exist in elementary schools. I think that they are compounded as we move on up the ladder into the secondary schools and that we should therefore address what we can do at the elementary level as well as at the secondary level.

DR. GARIBALDI: Thank you very much. Your point is very well taken. I am not sure of the identity of the gentleman who answered you. I myself would say that there is a very serious problem. However, the fact is that our program does represent not only secondary schools and junior high schools, but also elementary schools.

I think that with regard to the panel on Tuesday morning, there were probably 10 other organizations which also contacted us because they were not on the panel. We realize some omissions have been made. And we especially hope that individuals will come from the American Association of School Administrators, a group which is importantly involved with the issues under consideration here and which should not be excluded.

MR. KUBIC: My name is Ed Kubic and I work for an organization in Suffolk County, New York, called the Suffolk County Conference on Juvenile and Criminal Justice. We have been looking at school issues for about 2 years now -- mainly from the point of view of delinquency prevention.

Mr. Williams, I guess I am primarily interested in your comment on or reaction to what I am about to say. I feel that addressing the essential question of what exactly is the role of the schools in youth development ought to have been addressed tonight.

So many of the school administrators I talk to in New York feel that they are educators. So any child who comes through the schoolhouse door will be provided access to an education which has developed over the years and has been given to many other individuals who have grown up well.

But I wonder if it is the school's role to worry about whether or not a young person has had a proper breakfast, whether he is properly dressed, and whether he is developing well physically so that he is able to go to school every day to learn? And is it the school's role to worry and to address the problem of parents who might not be providing the discipline that will train their child to sit for 6 hours a day in school and profit from it? Is it the school's role to worry about whether or not parents are going to make sure the child does his homework at night, work with the child, and impress upon him the importance of these efforts?

I know most people believe the school is responsible for thinking about these matters. But what happens if the child is not properly cared for at home, and consequently some behavioral problems arise? Is it the school's role to take over for some parents and give their children what they are not getting at home or elsewhere? And if the school will not do this, then who will?

I would suspect that a lot of kids fail mainly because they have not been provided with many things they need or because they were not given any reinforcement. And at the same time, the school authorities are frustrated, not knowing what to do with the child, the parents, or the rest of the community where no one cares.

MR. WILLIAMS: Among the many institutions within our society that have responsibility for young people, the school stands out as critical because of its contact with such a large number of youth. At a minimum, the school would seem obligated to be aware of how problems originating outside its walls affect problems with which it must deal directly in order to effectively accomplish it goal of educating young people. In addition to simply being aware of the problems students may bring to the classroom, the school should assume some responsibility for maintaining effective networks with agencies and resources within the community which parents and students can utilize to address problems that are beyond the scope of the school's capability.

As you must realize, I am attempting to draw fairly stringent parameters for the school with respect to the question of youth development. This is because I see two primary difficulties in attempting to define a broad role for the school in the area of such development. First, no one institution can or should have general responsibility for youth development. If we assign this larger function to the school, we simply add to the identity crises from which that institution already suffers. Therefore, I would like to regard the school as one of many institutions that must coordinate their approaches and share responsibility for youth development.

The second difficulty I see is that, by formally giving this additional responsibility to the school, we provide a convenient and predictable cop-out for the school to use in explaining why instruction or discipline or any facet of its operations is in chaos. I would suggest, then, that the school needs to recognize some limits in what it can do. Regarding discipline, the school must come to understand that its staff does not have the resources to deal effectively with some of the problems students manifest. But on the other hand, the school can and should more effectively address many problems that are currently facing it. For instance, I think it is crucial to reduce the number of students suspended for minor repetitive misbehavior. I think the school would have additional time to focus upon some of the more serious difficulties that some students manifest in school. But additional problems are created when discipline problems

are approached as a single, unified phenomenon; school personnel must make distinctions between serious and sometimes criminal misbehaviors and simple rules of convenience for the institutions. So I suggest that the school should now carefully delineate the types of problems it is experiencing and establish priorities for addressing them.

MR. HYMAN: I would like to comment on what Mr. Williams has just been saying. We know from the corporal punishment research we have done that children use behavior they have seen as models for their own behavior in the community. And sometimes the models come from schools where authorities almost always hit students without due process, and often suspend them without due process. Our job is to prepare citizens for democracy. And we cannot do so if children are hungry, if they are sociopathic, if they are unable to read, or if they have similar basic difficulties. And it is even more impossible to prepare young people for democracy if they are not disciplined. If the schools reflect the process of democracy, it would seem that most discipline problems might be eliminated. I have some good research showing that, when "democratic" teachers left their classrooms unattended, the students were extremely well-behaved. But when authoritarian teachers left the room for 45 minutes, chaos ensued. The point is that in the democratic classroom children internalized controls, whereas in the authoritarian classroom control was external.

All the research, including the Safe School Study, suggests that if children feel that they have some say -- that they have some control over their own destiny and are treated fairly -- a great many discipline problems in the schools are eliminated.

QUESTIONER: I am in charge of in-school discipline at a junior high school at Triple Mountain Indian Reservation in North Dakota. You have been speaking a lot in percentage figures involving whites versus blacks, without going into data about other minority cultures.

MR. WILLIAMS: I had two people from Arizona come to the center within the last several months making points similar to yours. I told them that they would have to supply the material themselves, so that we could get to the kind of conclusions we should be generating. I think there are a lot of data that can be compared; we might look at the basic cultures and how they affect children's behavior both in and out of school, and how they affect the behavior of individuals from different backgrounds toward each other in school.

I think there are a lot of data to be found on these matters, but nobody has really tried to dig it out.

MR. GREEN: In Minneapolis we have the largest Indian population in an urban school district in the northern part of the United States. I would suspect that, because there is a great deal of discontinuity

between the reservation and the urban center, we see absenteeism and other such problems at a greater rate among the Indians than we do among other groups. I suspect that generally a school with a large concentration of Indians -- with a student population that might be perhaps 50 percent Indian -- would experience the problems under consideration at an unusually high rate. I would like to conclude by saying that, although I have not seen the data, my gut tells me that the dropout rate among Indians and their discipline problems have increased.

QUESTIONER: I am very disappointed that Latinos are not represented on this panel or any panel at this conference. However, I am hoping you can do some work regarding Latinos and suspension.

I would also like to say that the high schools in Dade County, Florida, in Miami have organized a group to reduce violence. I would like to speak to anyone at this conference who has made a similar effort.

DR. GARIBALDI: I would like to respond to your point about representation. In a conference such as this, there is always somewhat of a problem in terms of trying to get as many groups represented as possible. Latinos are represented here primarily by the Houston system, which has Latino students and includes some Latinos on its staff. And we have talked to people in both Houston and Dallas who are providing us with data on dropouts and suspensions among Lations.

To go back to an issue raised earlier, the Office for Civil Rights survey of Native Americans indicates that suspensions for Native Americans represent about one percent of the entire number of days lost due to suspensions and about half of one percent of all suspensions.

You have all been very attentive tonight and we thank you for beginning this conference with some penetrating questions, which hopefully will be answered in the next 2 days. Thank you.

SESSION II

WELCOMING REMARKS

Oliver Moles, Ph.D.
Patricia Albjerg Graham, Ph.D.

REMARKS OF DR. MOLES

We are delighted to have you sharing with us in this National Conference on In-School Alternatives to Suspension. I am Oliver Moles, head of the School Social Relations unit at the National Institute of Education.

We have something of a record number of people attending this conference. I think at last count there were about 500 people registered. Earlier we expected perhaps 300. I believe the actual number is a testimony to your interest in the problem we are dealing with today and to your search and ours for meaningful alternatives to suspension as a means for handling social conflict and alienation among students.

Looking at student progress in special educational settings within and outside of the school is an integral part of our unit's concern at the Institute. So we are quite pleased to be able to sponsor this conference, and so to study in more detail some of the programs that will be presented here a little later in the year.

In the introduction to this program you have been shown some of the purposes of this conference, but I would now like to reiterate them briefly. The question of "why bother" with alternatives to suspension and the need for meaningful alternatives, which were discussed last night, are twin issues we want to be concerned with here. The kinds of promising programs that Antoine Garibaldi has identified constitute another important area that will be discussed later today.

We are also interested in your comments on programs which your schools may have, as well as in your questions about the programs to be presented; for as much as possible, we want to share the information we have on programs around the country. At the same time, we realize that not all programs may be of equal utility, and that some may be more relevant for certain kinds of problems and schools than for others. The National Institute of Education is not advocating any one of these kinds of programs. We do recognize the problems they address, and we are interested in reasonable and fair and effective alternatives to suspension.

Later today there will be a Federal panel at the luncheon; I hope you will all have an opportunity to hear the presenters there. Tomorrow, professional associations will be presenting their viewpoints.

At this point I would like to introduce the Director of our Institute, Dr. Patricia Graham. Pat has been Director since last summer, and I think it is very significant for this conference that she is working to emphasize equality of educational opportunity since suspensions are so much more often given to minority students. Equality of educational opportunity is one of the central concerns of the Institute, but has received even more prominence under her leadership as it concerns minorities and women.

Most recently, Pat has been at the Harvard Graduate School of Education; she also headed the Radcliffe Institute. She worked for 10 years with teachers and teacher training programs in New York City and, earlier, taught public school in Indiana, Virginia, and Michigan. So Pat brings a wealth of experience to her work at the Institute. We are delighted to be working with her and to have her with us this morning.

REMARKS OF DR. GRAHAM

Thank you, Oliver. Let me simply repeat Ollie's word of welcome to this conference and reaffirm the deep commitment of the National Institute of Education to these inquiries.

There are two guiding principles that we at NIE apply to any question raised to us for potential additional investigation; for us, of course, such questions usually involve funding.

The first principle concerns the equity issue: Is this a project that is likely to increase equity in education? We want to engage in research that will help us to reduce the predictive value of race, sex, and social class for educational achievement. We do not expect to achieve such results within the next 2 weeks, 2 months, 2 years, or even longer than that. But we can think of no issue that is any more important for a Federal research agency concerned with education than this one.

The second principle we apply to any issue that comes to us concerns practice: Does the issue address improvements in local educational practice? As all of you know, education is still practiced in local settings. Sometimes we in the Federal Government have a tendency to forget that fact. Education is a matter in which State and local policy is dominant. We, as a national research agency, are very concerned that the research we engage in should be likely to, in fact, improve the kind of education that goes on in individual communities.

This conference and the issues to be addressed in the coming sessions meet the test of both of these criteria. I think the differential effects of race, sex, and social class are of great importance at the local level. Therefore, we welcome the opportunity to discuss them with you, so that we can get some policy guidance on subsequent activities which NIE, as well as other Federal, local, and State agencies, might pursue.

I might just make one observation about the whole question of suspensions and the issue of disruptive behavior in schools. Many of us who have very short memories think this is a recent problem uniquely affecting inner city schools. I am reminded of the fact that when I began teaching 25 years ago in a rural school in Southeastern Virginia, the major issue which faced us -- in those days it was a segregated all-white school -- involved the problems of disruptive students, violence, and vandalism in the classroom. I had a chair thrown at me the first term, and the second term, a knife pulled on me. And that was an absolutely rural setting. The Dismal Swamp was the area that it served.

If we think about what we read as children, we may remember such stories of the nineteenth century as The Hoosier Schoolmaster and The Hoosier Schoolboy by Edward Eggleston, which contained rural scenes of 150 years ago. Even then, the great issue for the schoolmaster was how to keep order in school.

I give those two examples to point out that the problem of school disruption is one that has affected us for a long time. It cuts across all the kinds of schools with which we are familiar, and it is a problem which we must resolve to the educational benefit of young people.

I welcome you and am delighted that you are here. Thank you.

SESSION II

INTRODUCTION OF REPRESENTATIVE SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

Belita Heron, Education Policy Fellow

Good morning. It is a pleasure to share the platform with such distinguished persons and to participate in this forum on In-School Alternatives to Suspension. I have the great honor of introducing to you this morning someone who is very dear to me, and for whom I have the highest respect. Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm.

If you will permit me, Mrs. Chisholm, I would like to begin with a sentimental journey. I recall the first time I met Mrs. Chisholm. My mother, some years ago, had managed to purchase two tickets for a scholarship benefit given by the Los Angeles Chapter of The Links, Inc., at which Mrs. Chisholm was to be the featured speaker.

Although today I no longer remember her specific remarks, I do recall the power, the enthusiasm, the drive and determination she communicated to her audience that evening. I remember too the challenge that she gave us all...to continue striving to be the best that we could be and to join her in making America live up to its promise of equality for all people.

The second time I had the privilege of meeting Mrs. Chisholm came last May, when I interviewed for a legislative assistant position in her Washington office. I remember being excited and a bit nervous about what I would say to a woman about whose life I had read and whom I desired to emulate. What was to have been an interview, however, turned out to be something that seemed a conversation between two friends, for there were no barriers, no desks between interviewer and interviewee. She made me relax and feel at home.

I left Mrs. Chisholm's office that afternoon, hoping I would get the job. But more importantly, I left feeling rejuvenated, determined, and having a great sense of personal power and purpose. What I had experienced in those two brief interfacings with her, and would come to know as an assistant in her office, was the great strength, capacity for compassion, and the charm and political wit of a woman, a beautiful black woman, whose leadership and example should serve as an inspiration to us all.

These qualities -- strength, compassion, drive, and determination -- were developed by Mrs. Chisholm when she was a child growing up in Brooklyn, New York. Indeed, Mrs. Chisholm, the daughter of a seamstress and a factory worker, credits her early achievements to a stable family life, strict in discipline, and to an educational environ-

ment where excellence was demanded and her abilities encouraged. She quickly established her basic commitment to the poor, the disadvantaged, and the downtrodden of society, and in this commitment she has always remained steadfast.

Mrs. Chisholm's qualities, talents, and abilities -- nurtured early by her parents -- have stood her well throughout her life. They have taken her through three degrees in education and earned her 15 honorary doctorates. They manifested themselves in her positions as a former New York City nursery school teacher and director of a child care center. They characterized her leadership in the New York State Assembly, where she served from 1964 to 1968. They thrust her into the limelight in 1969, as the first black woman to be elected to Congress, and in 1972, when she became the first woman of her race to run for the nation's highest office. They have carried her through many frustrating moments as the representative of the Twelfth District of New York, former memberships on the Agriculture and the Education and Labor Committees, and presently as a member of the powerful House Rules Committee.

In her positions as a secretary of the House Democratic Caucus and vice chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus, Mrs. Chisholm's characteristics and capacities have reaped for her the highest respect from her peers and from President Jimmy Carter, with whom she meets on a biweekly basis. And finally, they have recently evidenced themselves in her successful efforts to include several amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; these focus on increased parental involvment, biomedical education for secondary students, and setting aside funds for the disadvantaged gifted.

Someone once said that, in order to be a good leader and to survive in a position of major responsibility, an individual must be able to swim in a sea of sharks without becoming one him/herself. Indeed, Mrs. Chisholm is a person with such abilities.

At this time it is my esteemed pleasure and honor to introduce to you the Honorable Shirley Chisholm.

SESSION II

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Honorable Shirley Chisholm (D., N.Y.)

Thank you so much. I would really like to thank Belita for that wonderful introduction. One of the most wonderful things in my life thus far is to be able to live and see that I have touched so many wonderful young people who are related to me in terms of having worked on my staff, but have now gone on to bigger and better things as a result of others' recognition of their special traits, capacities, and abilities that I like to believe were developed by me.

In the past 10 years I have seen my staff go on to become councilmen, assemblywomen, assistant to the Vice President of the United States -- all types of positions -- and Belita is just one of a number of beautiful young people who have been touched by me -- and also by the fact that I have a great deal of faith in the young of this nation. And that is precisely why I am here today -- because I am very deeply concerned about the kind of legacy that we, as adults, are bequeathing to our younger generation.

I am pleased to join you here this morning to focus on an issue of very deep concern. The conference is indeed an important one, for we desperately need to address ourselves to the increasing alienation found in today's youth, and particularly to approaches which provide for alternatives to suspension.

Just last December, the National Institute of Education released its major study on school violence and vandalism. This study again documented a serious problem of school-based delinquency which affects elementary and secondary education. And although young people spend no more than 25 percent of their waking hours in school, some 40 percent of the robberies and 36 percent of the assaults upon teenagers occur in the schools.

On the other hand, the Children's Defense Fund and other groups have done excellent research on the inappropriate and arbitrary application of suspensions and expulsions to deal with the lack of discipline in our school setting. On the national level, there has been sporadic interest in the problem of school-based delinquency, particularly in the crisis confronting urban education.

The NIE study on safe schools was helpful, but it is my sincerest hope that those of us here this morning will move beyond the printed page and begin to actualize the solutions and the alternatives for which our young people cry out. Too often we look at school-based

delinquency as though it were the problem. It is not, my friends. It is a symptom, though a very serious one. Serious rates of delinquency and increasing suspensions point to the real crisis in American education, particularly in urban education.

There is a growing alienation of young people from our often-impersonal educational institutions, combined with an increasing inability of the schools to impart a sense of discipline and even the most basic skills. There is a feeling that most of our educational programs lack relevance to what young people believe they will need as adults. What we see is the ignition of a powderkeg of bitterness, anger and frustration in our young people. If our response to this symptom is building better locks, fences, security, and alarm systems, we will only be doing our young a greater disservice.

The alienation which has brought tension to the classroom is also reflected in a growing suicide rate for our young people. According to the National Center for Health Statistics, the suicide rate for young white males aged 15 to 19 has grown 171 percent in the period from 1950 to 1975. This is in contrast to a suicide rate for all white Americans, which increased only 18 percent overall in this period.

Will added security offices, guard dogs, electronic surveillance, or break-resistant windows make the lives of our young people more meaningful and vital? I hardly think so. We must look at these problems in the context of a society which has changed markedly in the past 2 decades, and we must realize that tradition is no longer the answer to the problems with which we are grappling.

The average youngster will spend some 900 hours each year in school, while this very same child will spend well over 1,000 hours yearly in front of the television. So when we remark on the alienation and violence of our young people, how can we avoid responsibility as a generation of parents who too often have turned to the tube as a caretaker for our children and a substitute for personal warmth and interaction?

Youngsters are often told by concerned parents and adults that violence, crime, promiscuous sex, and drugs are bad. Yet these represent almost the sole range of activities engaged in by the idols the media has given to our children. You would do better to ask a schoolchild to do an imitation of the Fonz than to ask him or her to read a simple English sentence.

Our educational institutions, by and large, have done little to improve this situation. Too many teachers are ill-equipped to deal with the serious problems that they encounter in the classrooms of the 1970s. Something must be done to improve our teacher training

institutions. We should note the NIE Safe School Study, which found that leadership abilities of principals and other school personnel were key factors in a school's ability to succeed.

There is a serious need to encourage leadership training for school personnel as valid programs of teacher retraining if we are to bring about positive change in our educational institutions. Futhermore, there is an inability -- and, more often, an unwillingness -- on the part of many schools to involve parents in the education of their children. Most of the traditional educational organizations reacted with unbridled hostility to amendments which I have introduced to ensure that parents are meaningfully involved in programs such as Compensatory Education (Title I). Well, if this particular attitude is indicative of the attitude toward parents in general, then it is no surprise that urban schools find teachers and parents in a combative rather than a cooperative kind of relationship.

So often, teachers and school administrators will respond by citing poor participation of these parents at PTA meetings or parent-teacher conferences as an example of a lack of interest in or commitment to the child's academic success. Unfortunately, the teachers and administrators conveniently forget that it is these same parents whose own experiences with school were so hostile and alienating that they either dropped out or were forced out, having simply stopped caring. It is not enough to mail out a bunch of mimeographed flyers and expect that these will change the impression that schools are sources of frustration and shame.

Any program designed to improve the quality of education must be built solidly on a commitment, and I mean that -- a gut commitment -- not superficial commitment in terms of policies of appeasement to subjugate hostilities or negative feelings that might be coming out. I am talking about gut commitment to find new ways of involving parents in the schools. And more importantly, I am talking about a commitment to develop respect, cooperation, and understanding between parents and teachers for the benefit of all our children.

We cannot continue to move in the direction of trying to keep parents out merely because they are laypersons who do not have academic training. We do not expect the parents to be the professionals. But we should expect them to be vitally interested and concerned, because they have a very important product in the school system -- their offspring.

So we should work more and more in terms of bringing the teacher and the parent together rather than having them pushed aside from each other. And it is not what you say, it is what you do that often indicates to the parents this kind of hostility and negativism towards them.

According to the Safe School Study, there are four major factors which impact upon the success of a school and on its ability to reduce alienation, suspensions, and delinquencies.

1. Size and Impersonality. Violence and suspensions are consistently higher in big schools which have large classes and where it is difficult for teachers to establish personal relationships with large numbers of students.

It is interesting to note that the highest proportion of problems occur in junior high school, when most students are beginning to experience a shift from the more personalized elementary setting to junior high schools, which are larger and in which students change teachers with each subject. Methods such as core curriculum, which give these students more sustained exposure to an individual teacher through the interrelationships of history, English, and social studies, may be one way of better enabling students to make that transition to the secondary school.

2. Systematic discipline. For some reason, people today tend to shy away from the words "strong discipline." We even hate nowadays to talk about "good" and "bad"; it is as though those are some kind of subversive terms. The problem even reaches out into our society, where parents are almost afraid to tell their children that something is "good" or "bad."

There appears to be a positive correlation between strong discipline, when it is fairly administred, and the reduction of delinquency. I have seen it in different school systems in this country. There are instances where there are written codes of conduct, according to which student peers are involved in resolving disputes and according to which contracts are developed between teachers, parents, and students interacting, sharing, and outlining the responsibilities that they each have.

Let us not think any longer about suspending or throwing young people out of school, or of resigning to the educational trash heap young people with whom we, as professionals, are perhaps not able to cope in the traditional educational setting.

A basic axiom and a basic truth is this: Wherever people have a piece of the action or wherever people are involved in some kind of regulations or rules that are going to have some type of determination on their lives, you will find a stronger kind of relationship developing. Therefore, my friends, do not be afraid to involve the parents and the teachers and the students as representatives to work out contracts to help resolve disputes; we need to get away from just outright suspensions and throwing our children out of school.

We have also seen that the rate of suspensions and expulsions for minority students by far exceeds that for white students. Now this has been particularly pronounced in instances of school desegregation, where black students bear the brunt of administrative discipline.

Schools must ensure that discipline is imparted fairly. Otherwise, a bad situation will only be exacerbated. We recognize that, as a result of the desegregation procedures in this country, when many black students were removed from their regular settings and moved into white settings, the expulsion and the suspension rates of these students have risen disproportionately, particularly in the South and the southwestern part of this country.

Why is this? Is this because black students or brown students are so bad that you just have to get rid of them? No. It is because we have depended so much on the traditional educational instruments and mechanisms that when we moved into the question of desegregation of many of our school systems, our teachers were not trained to deal with the attendant problems that would arise as a result of desegregation. And so many of these teachers, not able to cope, not able to understand -- many of them not having the opportunity to be exposed before to large numbers of black students coming into a school system -- many of them frightened, in a sense, and not being able to cope because they are the authoritative figures in the situation, found that the easiest thing to do was to expel and suspend.

3. Frustration. While it is important for students to have the desire to succeed, we must be sensitive to the fact that strong competition which excludes average or below-average students from incentives and rewards can add to the problem. While it is important to reward the best, schools must also direct some praise and attention to those who have improved the most.

4. Relevance. And this is key to me. Some educators do not agree with me on this point, but I feel very seriously about it.

Analyses of student responses to the NIE study revealed that perceptions as to the relevancy of educational programs do impact tremendously on delinquent behavior. When students feel -- or when they even perceive -- that their academic work will not provide them the skills or knowledge necessary to succeed in the real world which they will be going into in the future, there tends to be disinterest, resentment, and ultimately rebellion against an institution which is finally regarded as unresponsive.

And we have got to understand this. Now we may feel as educators that we know what is best for these young people or that because of their age bracket they are rebellious by nature, but we do have to recognize that, if this is a perception that is going on among 55 percent of the young people in this country, then it is something that

we have to address, whether or not we feel that we have the answer to all of the young people's problems merely because we are adults and we have the training.

We must not be afraid to own up to the fact that we do not know everything. We must not be afraid to own up to the fact that these young people, by their behavior and by their reaction, are asking us to assist them and to help them. The fact that they talk a certain way or even dress a certain way is only the superficial manifestation of the fact that they are crying out for help; and let us stop looking at these manifestations, and try to get beneath them to establish that dialogue which will help us and them.

All of the problems in these areas promote student alienation. For a moment I am just going to pursue the question of what alternatives do exist, and then that of how I think we must work at the Federal level to bring them about. It is clear that there is a strong need in this country at this moment, at this hour, at this minute, for support of alternative educational programs and other means to provide alternatives to suspension.

Not every student can thrive in the traditional nine-to-three school environment. One program which markedly upgraded academic relevance to an urban environment is STRIDE, Students and Teachers Really Interested in Drop-Out Education. This program was initiated in the Harlem school district of Rockford, Illinois. In response to the negative student attitudes and to the high rates of absenteeism and poor academic performance, the school initiated an alternative program whereby students could opt for a schedule of classes in the morning and then work during the afternoons in a job in which the school would place them.

The academic program is geared toward developing more personalized student-teacher relationships and providing these students with some employment-related opportunities. The school has done a great deal to eliminate motivational problems and enhance self-esteem for a group of students who would otherwise have been shut out of any success pattern other than crime.

The STRIDE Program is indicative of the revitalization that alternative programs can provide to education. We need to provide our educational institutions with assistance in identifying the causes of student alienation and then provide the support necessary to implement alternative programs that specialize in certain academic fields, combine learning and working, or provide for a school-within-a-school program which can give intensive academic and personal support to those students who require more personalized attention. And one of the things we have to recognize is that this is not only true in large urban areas but also, as Dr. Graham has said, in rural settings. This has become a nationwide problem. And one of the things we have to

recognize is that what has happened in practically all school systems in this country is that there has been the development of an impersonal relationship between teachers and children.

Unfortunately, it is the old problem. All these efforts require resources that are not presently available due to underestimated funding for education and the lack of coherent Federal policy toward alternative educational programs. Pieces of programs in different departments and different agencies, the right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing, and everybody reacting in a kind of an emergency crisis approach rather than a coherent, cohesive kind of approach that this kind of situation needs because it has now become a national problem.

You do not need me here this morning to spell out the various approaches that can be adopted or adapted at local levels to reduce the need for student suspensions and provide for alternative education, because I am aware that there are more than enough experts in this room who can address this issue. I believe that my message to you must therefore focus on a pressure which needs to be applied to Congress and the executive branch of government to obtain meaningful Federal action on behalf of alternative education and other programs to reduce student suspensions. It is amazing to me that our President recently presented an urban policy which does not include a strong component on urban education. As educational leaders and policymakers, it is your responsibility to call upon the President to address more meaningfully the crisis in our cities' schools across this nation. In January, hearings were held by the Economic Opportunities Subcommittee of Education and Labor on the Safe School Study, but these hearings seemed perfunctory.

I am just talking to you the way I see it. Having been in politics for 25 years and having gone to a lot of hearings, I have seen all these sheaves of documentation, analyses, facts, charts, and graphs later piled upon the shelves to collect some dust.

Everybody went through the motions of outlining the problems. Oh, we had all kinds of testimony. Beautiful. Everybody marches down to Capitol Hill to tell us what is wrong, what the problem is, yet nobody really moves beyond that to discuss the actions which can change almost immediately in our nation's schools or to provide the assistance and the leadership necessary to improve urban education.

There is a discernible lack -- and this is what really disturbs me -- a discernible lack of coordination among the various Federal agencies charged with implementing youth programs which relate to alternative education and the prevention of school-based delinquency. There are numerous programs in HEW's Office of Education, including emergency school aid, alcohol, drug abuse education, runaway youth programs in the Office of Human Development and in the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of LEAA. There have been

congressionally mandated thrusts in the area of school-based delinquency and alternative education. Oh, my heavens, the rhetoric abounds.

And the Department of Labor has responsibility for numerous job training programs, particularly the new Youth Employment Initiative created by Congress last year. And finally, there are the new National Youth Service programs. My heavens, with all this money, with all these programs coming, why are we having such a problem with our youth?

All this Federal money is going out for these different programs, yet there is still a lack of coordination and cooperation. Also, from where I sit, everyone, or practically everyone, involved in the bureaucracy jealously and zealously guards his or her little fiefdom.

And you can see how people jealously and zealously guard their fiefdoms as this Administration moves to establish a separate Department of Education. And the community-based organizations and your schools suffer, because the poor folks out there are somehow expected to make sense out of these bureaucratic entanglements and paper all over the place. Hah.

One positive step would be for the Administration to mandate an effort of the coordination of resources for alternative education, and possibly a task force of these agencies to develop an across-the-board cooperative relationship which will avoid administrative duplication and allow for maximum assistance to State and local efforts.

Prior to the hearings on the Safe School Study in January, I seriously considered introduction of legislation to provide for a coordinated alternative education act, but I was encouraged by the Office of Juvenile Justice that they themselves were getting ready to implement a program along these lines and that additional legislation was not necessary.

Three months have passed and there's been no action. I am somewhat discouraged that few of the dollars which have been appropriated for the Office of Juvenile Justice in the past 2 years have been obligated or expended. And although our schools are in a desperate situation and youth service organizations are crying for funds, this fact makes it extremely difficult for a person like myself, who is very involved in education on Capitol Hill, to build a case for increased appropriations, when you're not using what's out there.

In conclusion, I believe that the time has come for educators and educational policymakers to become much more vigilant and stand up and shout and be counted and push for prompt action at the Federal level. Congress is certainly not immune from criticism, as little energy has

been spent focusing on this very serious problem up to now in the Congress.

A plan of action needs to be assembled. You're the experts in here. Draw up a plan of action. Get it up to the Hill. We couldn't exactly ignore this plan of action, and you're concerned when you, as the leaders in this particular area from all over the country, have assembled here for a couple of days in Washington, D.C., to do so. We couldn't ignore it. And then after this plan of action is assembled, elected officials and the Federal bureaucracy must be held accountable for its implementation.

It is my hope that you will use this conference as an opportunity to bring about some action, not merely another ream of proceedings which will be put into a book and mailed out next year. Individuals at the local level need to be made aware of the ways in which they can impact upon the Federal decisionmaking process. Any efforts to bring about concerted community action can only rebound favorably on our effort to seek a revitalization of urban education.

The trends for the future are far too serious to overlook, and I hope that we may be able to work together to successfully meet the challenge that tomorrow is certainly going to bring.

Thank you for listening to me.

SESSION II

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

DR. MOLES: We want to thank Congresswoman Chisholm for this very stirring call to action, on the parts of both educators and people in the Federal Government. Ms. Chisholm has said that she is willing to entertain one or two questions, so I think at this point we will open the floor.

MRS. CHISHOLM: Ladies and gentlemen, I have to get back up to Capitol Hill, but I do not think it would be exactly fair if I did not give an opportunity for one or two questions. I only have one restriction. Do not ask me individual questions pertaining to your district. I know sometimes at these conferences there is a tendency to do this, so I just say that.

QUESTIONER: What is the nature of your own bill on this matter, the one you propose?

MRS. CHISHOLM: Well, my bill has a combination of work experiences and part-time school attendance. My bill also deals with the fact that we should have more regular conferences with the parents of these young people who are in trouble and who need different kinds of options. My bill also deals with the fact that we must find ways for providing for the input of parents and for encouraging parents to become much more involved in developing their youngsters in the different kinds of alternative programs we may have. That is very important, because I know many school officials will say, "But you know, Mrs. Chisholm, you know we just can't get the parents interested."

And let me say something to you that is very important. I think one of the things that many schools are going to have to do in this country is provide child care services when there are meetings which parents are expected to attend, particularly since most of these meetings can only be scheduled during the evening hours because people cannot come during the day for all the reasons which you know so well.

I was in West Virginia, Tennessee, and Georgia recently, and I was amazed to see some of the people coming to the meetings and then to talk with them, because I am very interested and concerned. When I talked with these people, they said that they never would come to these meetings, because, of course, they are afraid to leave the children at home for a lot of reasons. Many of them are from single parent homes, and many of the husbands work at night. But what happened is that these communities set up volunteer crews of people to be available on a monthly basis to take care of children whose parents wanted to participate, and they found that the attendance at these

meetings jumped 60 to 75 percent -- once the parents knew there was going to be somebody there to take care of their children.

So what I am trying to do is bring some new ideas and new concepts, in order to strengthen the relationship between professional educators and parents.

QUESTIONER: Is your major concern with the proposed Department of Education the fact that it does not consider the problems of urban education or special projects? And if it did have that provision, would you then be in favor of it?

MRS. CHISHOLM: Well, my major concern is not with that per se, although that is one of my concerns. My major concern is with the entire question of creating a Department of Education. I know somebody will ask me what my feelings are about this. Joe Califano and I are very good friends, and, well, we fight at times and we laugh at each other at times, but Joe knows how I feel about this. I have mixed feelings about a separate Department of Education. I think it is good, and I think there can be some drawbacks.

Let me tell you -- I will have to come to a definite position in the next couple of weeks -- but let me tell you about what I am concerned. There is a need in this country, we recognize, for the coordination and the pulling together of all the educational programs that are found in different agencies throughout the country. Essentially, we have found that there is duplication, a lack of coordination, and all the problems that occur whenever there is a proliferation of similar programs trying fundamentally to address themselves to similar problems.

So if you had a Department of Education, and you put in all these educational programs, with a few exceptions, I understand the necessity, and from that standpoint it is good. But then if I say it is good, why am I holding back? I am holding back from the standpoint of a legislator. As a legislator on Capitol Hill for the past 9-1/2 years, I have seen that educational legislation would never really go anywhere unless and until the labor lobbyists on the Hill gave the thrust. It has only been within the past 5 or 6 years that educational people in this country have begun to realize that politics is important. I remember, some time back, 5 or 6 years ago perhaps, when I would hear: "But we don't want to bother with politics. You know, educators shouldn't become involved with politics." But now everybody is realizing that politics controls the water we drink, the air we breathe, and everything we do. We are becoming interested now, but it takes years to know the personalities on the Hill, it takes years to know how to approach certain people, where the bodies are buried, and where the levers of power are. From this standpoint, the labor lobbyist has become a powerful force on the Education and Labor Committee on the Hill.

Now, if we have a separate Department of Education, it means that we will probably have to divide the Education and Labor Committee. We will have an Education Committee, I daresay, and we will have a Labor Committee, and a lot of people will be happy because we will have more new fiefdoms, more appropriations, et cetera.

What I am worried about is this: I am not interested in having a separate Department of Education, if it is just going to be a department in rhetoric and a department in letterhead without any real clout on Capitol Hill to implement the kind of lobbying that is needed to change policy in this country.

My position is this: If you are going to have a separate Department of Education, the educational interest groups in this country better begin right now to start developing some very serious training sessions which could be set up in Washington, D.C., as to how to become effective lobbyists. If they do not, everything will be lost, and we will have a beautiful education department -- but only on paper. I have been in this business for 23 years, and I know exactly what happens. This is what concerns me.

Now, if members of the educational community can somehow assure me that they will move in this direction and that they can do this, I would feel a little bit better about saying yes, go ahead with it. I do not know if that makes sense to you.

QUESTIONER: Yes, thank you.

MR. JENKINS: My name is Robert Jenkins and I am from Community School District 17 in Brooklyn, New York. In following along with your discussion, Congresswoman Chisholm, I would like to know whether you would perhaps be willing to use the power of your office to organize a consortium of agencies that would begin to look at the development of a national policy on alternative programs?

MRS. CHISHOLM: I would be very willing to do this, but I must tell you, I will not and cannot take the initiative because of my involvement in so many other things right now. I would prefer that those of you interested in this issue and attending this conference take the initiative. However, I will be willing to meet some leaders and give you a sense of direction and thrust and assign one of my staff to assist in the development of such a task. But once again, I reiterate that you must take the initiative.

DR. MOLES: We want to thank Congresswoman Chisholm very much for the very stirring speech she has given us, for staying to answer questions, and for the challenges that we will keep in mind as we move through this conference.

SESSION II

IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION: THE STATE OF THE ART

Antoine M. Garibaldi, Ph.D.

During the 1972-73 academic year, the U.S. Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW) collected data on more than 2,900 desegregating school districts. Since the publicizing of those results, increased concern has arisen over the large numbers of students being suspended and expelled from elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. These data, reanalyzed by the Children's Defense Fund in 1975, also revealed that nonwhite students were being disproportionately affected by various public school methods of disciplinary action. In the past, blame has usually been placed on the student because of his or her inability to display appropriate behavior in school. But recently, due to the possible racial, cultural, and social implications of disciplinary actions, school districts around the country have been experimenting with new approaches to keep students in school during suspension, as well as providing these youth with prescriptive strategies for eliminating unacceptable behavior.

What follows is a synopsis of the varieties of in-school alternatives to suspension currently being used. The process for the collection of this information entailed 6 months of literature reviews, ERIC searches, site visits to schools, phone conversations with administrators, teachers, government program specialists and project officers, as well as personal correspondence. For the patience of my respondents, I am most grateful. While it is impossible to render full justice to any particular program or type of in-school alternative within the time frame allotted to discuss "the state of the art," this paper outlines: (a) the methodology used for collecting information on in-school alternatives to the suspension and expulsion process; and (b) some suggestive comments on precautions and limitations of in-school programs designed to reduce suspensions.

However, the function of this paper is to provide assistance to students and school personnel. For to only develop programs to reduce out-of-school suspensions without concentrating on the behavioral, social, and psychological difficulties of students, as well as the organization of schools, merely provides temporary treatment to a growing cancer affecting the well-being and social climate of the nation's public schools.

The National Institute of Education's School Social Relations Staff is aware of the evolution of these programs in school districts all over the country. It is their contention that now is the time

to research the effectiveness of such ongoing programs. Thus, funds have been set aside to conduct an external impact study beginning in the summer of 1978. This conference is a prelude to that effort, as well as part of NIE's contribution to the Interagency Student Suspension Committee, initiated by DHEW Assistant Secretary for Education Mary Berry, chaired under the leadership of Deputy Assistant Secretary for Education Peter Relic. It should also be understood that the sponsoring of this conference by the National Institute of Education does not constitute an endorsement of in-school alternative programs.

PROCEDURE

In the initial stages of this project, careful boundaries were established to narrow the scope of the study. Having been an Urban League Street Academy director in St. Paul, Minnesota, my first inclination was to focus on alternative schools, primarily because these programs not only serve suspended and expelled students, but also because it is those young people who inevitably drop out of school as a result of the suspension or expulsion process. However, it was evident that alternative schools not only had a multiplicity of rationales for operating (i.e., political, social, academic, etc.), but also served diverse student populations (i.e., the handicapped, the gifted, socially maladjusted, etc.). Thus, a decision was made early in the process to focus only on those bona fide programs which labelled themselves as "alternatives to suspension" or a facsmile thereof.

Attempting to identify programs by their names also presented problems. After surveying some sources, it was facetiously suggested that a study simply of program nomenclature could be considered a single research effort. Program titles ranged from "Time-Out Room," "Reclamation Room," to "Alternative Learning Center," "In-School Suspension Center," as well as acronyms that gave little clue to program content (e.g., PASS - Positive Alternatives to Student Suspension, OCSC - On Campus Student Suspension Center, etc.).

Having discovered that the ERIC System yielded very little information on specific programs, different procedures were necessary. Inquiries were disseminated through the newsletter "Creative Discipline," published by the Southeastern Public Education Project (Columbia, South Carolina), through state and local departments of education, and through a variety of agencies within the U.S. Office of Education, specifically the Equal Educational Opportunity Programs Branch. In addition to these sources, the Project for the Fair Administration of Student Discipline at the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor) shared materials which they had collected on in-school alternatives to suspension. Otherwise, the process was less structured and expedited through phone conversations and informal meetings with educators knowledgeable in this area.

DESIGN

In preparing for the selection of programs to be presented at this conference and the initial framework of the impact study, a series of questions were developed to be used as criteria for evaluating in-school alternatives to suspension. Although hypotheses were developed around the questionnaire items, an attempt was made to ask questions in the least suggestive and restrictive manner. They encompassed seven major areas:

1. History of the Program

   This section entailed a program initiation date and the major concerns and significant school issues that may have generated the development of the program (e.g., high suspension/expulsion rates, excessive tardiness, absenteeism, class-cutting, student misconduct).

2. Philosophy of the Program

   This part of the questionnaire asked respondents to explain:

   a. The program's mission statement and major objectives for operation.

   b. The theoretical model employed for working with students (e.g., reality therapy, values clarification, Adlerian psychology, behavior modification and contracting, transactional analysis, group/individual counseling).

   c. The a priori "criteria for success" of both the program and the student that could most often be interpreted in measurable objectives (e.g., low recidivism rates, better attendance, higher academic achievement).

3. Student Characteristics

   Aware of the disproportionate numbers of nonwhite, poor, and male students usually suspended from school based on the surveys of the Office for Civil Rights and the Children's Defense Fund, programs visited were asked to provide a proportional breakdown of students by age, grade level, sex, race, and socioeconomic status.

4. Program Administration and Management

   Here a series of programmatic and process questions were asked:

a. How and by whom are students referred to the program?

b. How many students can be served at any one time, daily, and annually?

c. What are the major disciplinary reasons for which students are referred to the program?

d. Are students still suspended out of school despite the availability of the in-school suspension program? And if so, for what reasons?

e. Do students have an option of choosing between out-of-school suspension and the in-school program?

f. How are students' due process rights handled with the availability of the in-school suspension program?

g. How many staff members are there in the program, and what are their roles in the in-school alternative?

h. What are the general perceptions of the regular teaching and administrative staff about the in-school program? Are they aware of the program and do they understand its purpose?

i. What is the source and amount of annual funding for the program?

5. Program Activities

In this section, program directors and staff were asked to elaborate on these questions and statements:

a. Describe a typical sequence of activities for students from program entrance to exit.

b. What does the academic component of the program entail, how is it coordinated with regular classroom instruction (i.e., superior, inferior, or equal)?

c. Does the program have a counseling component? If so, what does it consist of?

d. What is the average length of stay for each student?

e. What restrictions are placed on students while in the program? (e.g., Do they eat lunch at the regular time and with the student body? Can they participate in extracurricular activities?)

f. In want ways do the program and staff attempt to get at the heart of the discipline problem -- to its causes? Are any diagnostic services provided?

g. Is parent involvement encouraged and utilized, and in what ways?

h. Does the program align itself with any community projects and engage in outreach activities that inform the public of their purposes in operating, as well as encourage referrals of young people who may benefit from this service?

i. Are regular students who are not having problems free to consult the program staff for help or supplemental guidance services at any time?

6. Facilities

Since the physical environment directly influences the social and academic climate of learning, program staff were asked to provide the following information:

a. Describe the space used by the program.

b. Indicate where the space assigned to the program is located (e.g., in a portable classroom off campus, in a classroom adjacent to the principal's office, in the gymnasium behind the stage, in a far corner of the building).

7. Evaluation

Since this process is akin to philosophy and purposes, we asked:

a. Has the number of out-of-school suspensions been reduced as a result of the program?

b. How many students return to the program during an academic year?

c. Is there any concern that students will want to return to the program, and, if so, what does the record show about their subsequent academic performance and behavioral adjustment?

These questions provided not only a framework for collecting data on the programs, but also made it possible to make some initial speculations as to their viability. What follows are the tentative categories established from the results of the survey.

IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION

In-school alternatives to suspension take on a variety of configurations and encompass an array of successful interventions that may be used for the student encountering problems at school. Some alternatives are informal, i.e., they follow a set of standard guidelines that a teacher may use in the event of classroom crises. Other alternatives, however, are more formal programs which fundamentally serve the purpose of removing the student from the area where a specific conflict has arisen.

The schema for attempting to devise a rather accurate, concise, and descriptive typology of programs was initially based on the following factors:

1. How long can or does a student remain within a particular program?

2. What does the program propose to do while the student is in the program (e.g., provide academic remediation, guidance services, behavioral change)?

3. What type of theoretical model or intervention strategy is used within the program?

However, after a thorough analysis of questionnaire results and site visits to programs, it was obvious that such a set of criteria was not satisfactory.

1. Some programs had no set time limits for a student's participation in the program. In some cases, students could be assigned for as short a period of time as 1 class period up to as long as 40 days, or an entire semester.

2. Most programs were not rigidly defined in terms of the delivery of sevices. Some were more academically focused and less counseling oriented; others were more counseling focused than academically based; some provided neither counseling nor academic services; and others equally distributed the amount of counseling and academic activities. Moreover, students were required only to "sit and think" in some less structured programs.

3. Every program did not utilize an established behavioral/theoretical model for intervention. In some cases, the model was undefined and rested solely on the philosophy and "charisma" of that individual directing the program. However, in other instances, the strategy was based on a single technique or combinations of models such as values clarification, reality therapy, transactional analysis, Adlerian psychology using the Dreikurs

approach with parents and students, behavioral modification, behavioral contracting using an elaborate system of reinforcements through token economies or other reward systems, decisionmaking skills through the use of moral judgment, and also nondirective counseling where students were required to "get in touch" with their feelings.

Despite the fact that the data were not as uniform as expected, a typology was still possible. One glaring result, however, that became obvious after careful study, was the fact that some models were better suited for urban and large metropolitan areas than for suburban and rural areas (e.g., an after-school program in a rural area would not encounter the transportation and staffing problems that an urban district would face). The three major types of in-schooll alternatives discussed in the following pages are "time-out rooms," "in-school suspension centers," and counseling and guidance programs. Moreover, an additional section briefly describes other types of alternatives that are possible and currently being used.

Time-Out Rooms

These programs are depicted usually as a classroom or some small facility in the school building where a student is assigned to "cool off" for a specified time of one to three class periods per day. A student is usually assigned here following a classroom disruption that generally is perceived as an action that could inevitably lead to a suspension or expulsion. In some districts, being assigned to the "time-out room," whatever the duration, constitutes a sanctioned suspension, whereas in other cases placement is perceived as a preventative method for reducing the possibility of a potential suspension or expulsion. Most rooms are staffed by one or two individuals who serve as guidance counselors and/or monitors of academic activities which the student is normally responsible for when he is in class. On the other hand, some programs require that the student merely sit in silence and reflect on the prior incident. Reassignment to regular classes is not always based on established policies and criteria. Generally, it is the responsibility of the administrator to decide when the student may leave the program and return to class. However, there are instances whereby the time-out room monitor is given that authority. Another option also exists in which the student writes a behavioral contract for his subsequent conduct in the school. This document is co-signed by the staff person in charge of the program and, in some cases, the parent.

The location and physical space of time-out rooms vary from school to school. Some are found in the central classroom areas; others next to the principal's office; and many in inconspicuous places such as on remote corridors of the building, in the basement or lower area of the school, or in a portable classroom on the school campus. Many program directors feel that these scarcely noticeable locations can serve a useful purpose by taking a student from the normal flow of school

activities and peers. Thus, the amount of distractions are reduced so that the youth can focus more attention on his or her academic work and behavior. However, it is not unreasonable to think that isolating students from peers also serves as a punitive strategy that will deter the student from ever wanting to return.

Categorically, time-out rooms are used for short-term suspensions. If run properly, humanely, and with a structured format, they can serve a more useful purpose than sending a student to the office to await in trepidation the decision of a principal. The qualifications of the staff are important, as well as the amount of interaction involved between the student, principal, sending teacher, and parent. These programs, because they are short-term, provide a limited amount of academic and counseling services and, in many cases, no intervention at all. When the program takes the shape of the latter, time-out rooms become either "cooling-off" areas or detention centers which deprive students of privileges and participation in extracurricular activities.

In-School Suspension Centers

In-school suspension centers are extensions of time-out rooms. Here a student spends a range of one day to an entire semester in the program. The referral process is, for the most part, the same as that for time-out rooms -- from a teacher through a principal. These programs are typically staffed by a minimum of three persons who have the responsibility for providing academic work, guidance services, and the maintenance of contact between the home and school. Depending upon the length of time spent by a student in the program, academic assignments may come solely from the regular teachers or may be supplemented by that individual who is accountable for teaching in the center. The teacher, guidance counselor, and home-school liaison person also plan group counseling or "rap" sessions whereby students can share their views about the school or personal situations, as well as provide reaction to audiovisual presentations and value-oriented games. This group counseling process, although very useful in many situations, possesses some specific risks and limitations, e.g., the shy student who is unaccustomed to and uncomfortable with self-disclosing anything in groups larger than two; the hostile or opinionated student who habitually maligns the school personnel and organizational process of the school, thereby attempting to persuade the program staff to take his perspective; and the student who has a personal or home-related problem that is too embrassing to talk about in public. Here, flexibility must be used to allow each student the availability of guidance services.

In-school suspension centers vary in their imposition of restrictions on students. Most programs within this category attempt to limit the amount of contact students have with their regular classmates primarily through a modular academic and lunch schedule. Depending upon the status or stigma attached to the program within the school or community, this isolation can serve either a positive or negative function.

Students from the center who may be "marched in" during the regular lunch period may encounter jeers and excessive harassment by their fellow students and intensify the psychological alienation of the suspended student. On the other hand, if the progam is well-respected by students, administrators, teachers, and parents, having suspended students eat lunch with the entire student body may enhance their sense of school spirit and camaraderie with peers. In these instances, the perception of the program may dictate the appropriate strategy to be used.

In-school suspension centers generally are conducive to learning. Despite the fact that the classroom is not in a highly visible area, many programs have reference materials and textbooks, intructive sayings and posters on the walls, and even lounge areas where students can talk informally with other students and staff. Those, however, which possess no windows, for example, are typified by a lack of activity and soon inherit the unpopular title of "the pits" by students. The successful management of an in-school center, the amount of structure incorporated into the daily activitites, and the enthusiasm and rapport that is generated by the staff may assist students in forming more positive impressions of responsibility and self-discipline, as well as enhance their academic motivation and self-concept.

Counseling and Guidance Programs

The third major type of in-school alternative to suspension is that specifically designed for the purpose of providing guidance and counseling services. Because these programs focus only on counseling, the amount of time spent by students is dependent upon the seriousness of the infraction, the length of a daily counseling session, and the success of the therapy. Thus, a student assigned for cursing a teacher will obviously not spend as much time with the counselor as a student sent for hitting a teacher, if indeed a school administrator will allow such an assignment based upon the seriousness of that infraction of school policy. The therapeutic models used in these guidance programs range from transactional analysis to reality therapy, from Adlerian psychology to nondirective counseling, and from values clarification to the use of the Kohlberg stages of moral judgement. Moreover, the process for referral is less rigid, and a teacher, in many instances, as well as a parent, may refer the youth to the counseling program.

Staff sizes in these programs are generally small. Some, however, compensate by utilizing the additional services of graduate school interns, as well as para-counselors and social workers from community organizations. Here, one central facility is not necessary, but the availability of rooms where non-interrupted counseling can take place is imperative.

Because most schools have limited counseling and guidance staffs for large student bodies, this type of alternative is very appealing.

However, there is a potential area of perceived threat by the regular counseling staff if the alternative program staff do not interact and share the delivery of services within the confines of a school building. Cooperation should be the rule rather than the exception to the rule.

Miscellaneous In-School Alternatives

There are many other in-school alternatives which cannot be elaborated on but do deserve mention. Below is a brief description of these additional alternatives.

1. Ombudsperson -- This alternative is not as widely used as some of the aforementioned strategies. Ombudspersons serve as mediators in student-teacher conflicts, parent-administrator-teacher disagreements, and in student crises. Moreover, they act as liaisons between students and teachers and seek to enhance communication, as well as serve as spokespersons for facilitating students' requests to the faculty as in the case of extracurricular activities. The model has been tried in many areas, but very few currently remain as viable strategies for reducing out-of-school suspensions.

2. After School Counseling Clinics -- These programs are positive alternatives to the normally punitive detention center approach. A program in Lafayette, Louisiana, has students meet for one and a half hours after school and utilizes values clarification and decisionmaking techniques. Students talk out their problems with two staff persons in a group counseling format. The staff members are part of the regular teaching staff and are paid out of the regular school budget and with Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) funds. Students are taken home by a regular school bus, and parents are informed of the students' participation in the clinic. The model works well for this small district but would encounter major problems of implementation in large urban areas.

3. Hall Monitors -- This kind of "roving counselor" approach seeks to identify crises and students having problems immediately, and serves the purpose of providing intervention before major conflicts ensue. The model is preventive in scope and does not require the use of additional financial assistance from the local board or State and Federal Governments.

4. Pupil Problem Teams -- These itinerant personnel usually comprise a counselor, social worker, psychologist, and often a parent. Regular visits are made by these individuals to schools within the geographic area or when the need arises at a particular school.

5. School Survival Courses -- This technique is part of the regular curriculum whereby students are required to or may elect to take a class which provides them with strategies for becoming better learners, staying out of trouble, taking more responsibility for their behavior, and understanding the consequences of engaging in behavior that is not socially approved. This model also is preventative.

6. Work-Study Programs -- In some cases, students may "work off" a suspension by either doing chores after school or enrolling in a program that is equally distributed between academic instruction and an assigned place of employment that pays students for their services. This type of program very often may be funded with Vocational Education funds or through the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA).

7. Saturday Schools and Evening School -- These types of programs have been popular in some areas of California, and generally require the student to spend a half day at school on Saturday or late one evening either to do academic assignments or to clean the building.

8. Peer Counseling Programs -- Oftentimes referred to as Positive Peer Culture, this model usually entails training students in a variety of guidance fundamentals so that they can counsel their peers who get into trouble. While this approach is very effective and less threatening for the student and the teacher, limitations exist in the amount of authority that can be entrusted to the peer counselor.

9. Alternative Schools -- Though not part of the scope of NIE's investigation into in-school alternatives, alternative schools ideally have served suspended and expelled students, as well as dropouts and those students who are unable to function in traditional school environments. They are located off-campus, provide conducive learning environments, and consist of committed staff persons who provide the motivation for students to complete their graduation requirements. Alternative schools are more long term since they seek to get at "the root" of the student's disenchantment with school. Moreover, options exist whereby the student can return to his/her regular school at any time during the school term. Models such as Urban League Street Academies have provided educational services comparable to public schools since 1965 in a variety of geographical locations throughout the United States. "Free Schools" and "Open Schools" also fall within this category.

The models which have been presented are in no way all-inclusive, but they do provide a framework for considering the varieties of alter-

natives to suspension that are possible. Time has been spent here focusing on some of the more promising and positive alternatives that are currently in existence. However, it should be understood that there are many programs which are very punitive. Seeking to isolate a child by putting him/her in a soundproof booth or in a remote cellar of the school does not help the child. A caveat is in order here, for such programs exist in modern education. Moreover, the hidden agenda of school personnel who wish to develop programs in order to strengthen their coaching staff, as one interviewee indicated, deserves a similar note of caution. The rationale there is very clear, but once again providing additional services to students should be the purpose of any in-school alternative to suspension.

The eight programs represented here at the conference are a cross-section of the three major types of in-school alternatives to suspension. It is worth noting also that funding is received from a variety of sources. Some are supported through local district and individual school budgets, state departments of education, ESAA and Vocational Education funds, as well as through joint arrangements between independent school systems and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). In addition, these programs have effectively involved parents, teachers, and administrators not only in the proposal process but also in the implementation of daily activities. Such cooperation is necessary to the longevity of any educational component.

As we lead into the panel sessions, we expect you to ask the program representatives those questions we have failed to ask and share with them those insights you have learned from your own experiences. Through this process we can certainly begin to make American education not only better, but also more equitable for all.

SESSION III

IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION: A PANEL PRESENTATION

INTRODUCTION BY DR. BLANCHARD

This morning we have four distinguished panelists who will talk with us about their programs, the manner in which their programs were initiated, the quality of participation, and the effects of those programs.

On my far left we have Mr. Morris Gordon from the Douglas School Behavior Modification Clinic in Chicago, Illinois. Next to him is Ms. Lynn Pinkerton from the Student Referral Center in Houston, Texas. Then we have Mr. Alfred Clark from Project COPE -- Contractual Opportunity Programs Education -- in Los Angeles, California; and Mr. Milton Crosby, director of the Social Work Approach to Suspension Program, from Harvey, Louisiana.

Each of the panelists will have 10 to 15 minutes to speak about his or her program. After each panelist has had an opportunity to speak, we will open the floor for questions.

Here, then, is Mr. Morris Gordon.

PRESENTATION BY MR. GORDON

Thank you, Dr. Blanchard.

In-school alternatives have been effective in our schools mainly because the staff, the faculty, and PTA, and most of the student body have been working together to help make them effective. For years we have watched the results of sending students home, and we have seen that many never even reach home, but are left wandering in the streets. We feel that it is in the best interest of the student for him to remain in our school's atmosphere. We know that this atmosphere is more conducive to learning than that which may exist in his home or in the street.

So now students are programmed to our center -- that is, the Behavior Modification Clinic or the Behavior Modification Room -- by the principal, the assistant principal, and sometimes myself. Teachers send their grievances to the office, where these are carefully scrutinized before a recommendation is made to send the student to our inner-school suspension room. However, even those who are not sent to the clinic are counseled and advised.

Because we want to deal with the problems of as many individuals as possible, any student is welcome to come to the clinic voluntarily. No problem is too small. And we even include pre-kindergarten children in our program; we go back to Head Start. For instance, one day a little boy came to me and said, "Mr. Gordon, a girl took my Crayola." And I said, "What is her name and who is she?" He said, "You know her. She is your daughter." So that was a problem I had to handle by myself.

But when students do go to our center, they find structured classrooms. These pupils receive their regular assignments from their teachers. If this work seems a little too complicated for a given student to cope with, he is given special assistance; we either send for the student's regular teacher or we escort him to his teacher's room where he will receive extra help. Through this process, the student can better understand whatever homework or assignment has been given him.

Observations on the resource teacher's card determine how long a student will remain in the room. The amount of time spent there varies from 1 to perhaps 5 days, depending on the particular individual's progress. For example, when the attitudes of two fighters have changed so that they are no longer enemies but friends, we feel that perhaps it is time for them to go back to class. On the other hand, when assaults, verbal or physical, have been made upon teachers, a student is usually kept in the in-school suspension room until parents come for a conference. If his bitterness still continues, the student is placed in another teacher's room for a while; for perhaps there is a personality conflict between the particular pupil and his instructor. In other words, we recognize that a student's difficulties frequently do not reside wholly within himself. Such changes have therefore often been very effective. Many other problem situations, such as students with knives or chains, are dealt with in a variety of ways; for example, parents may be requested to pick up their children and schedule a conference.

Certain privileges are denied to the students while they are in the in-school suspension room. While they are there, pupils are allowed to go neither to gym nor to our assembly. We feel that many students like our gym program, which includes intramural activities such as volleyball, basketball, and softball. Therefore, in order to participate in this program, students do everything possible to remain out of the in-school suspension room.

Sometimes we feel it is necessary to exclude the students from other activities such as trips -- especially if they have behaved badly on a past outing. Hopefully, they will thus learn their lesson and try to maintain better discipline in future instances. Likewise, while they are in the suspension room, students may not be permitted to participate in our talent shows. This can serve as an incentive

for good behavior, since many youth who are unable to read or write as well as others are extremely capable of singing, dancing, and otherwise performing.

We are interested in molding the characters of all students. We are also interested in keeping all students out of the in-school suspension room as much as possible. However, at times we know that such prevention is not feasible. And when students do come to this room, we try to counsel them, guide them, and direct them in such a way that they can immediately get back into the mainstream of society. Thank you.

PRESENTATION BY MS. PINKERTON

First, I would like to emphasize that the program we have in Houston is obviously just a stop-gap measure. Hopefully, in the future, suspension will be something that is used very rarely.

The program we have in Houston is unique in several ways. A number of years ago, we discovered frequent duplication of services to young people in the Houston school district. But while many programs were dealing with the same young people, each program passed the buck on the next one. The parent could not or did not give the child what he/she needed. The school system, for whatever reason, in turn was not prepared to meet these needs. So the child frequently became involved with the police, the probation department, and then frequently returned to the community where he started. He was on a merry-go-round. His needs were never met, and he was passed from one agency to another.

The Student Referral Center in Houston is trying to combine the resources and the expertise of the major systems that deal with young people. The program is a joint endeavor between the Houston Independent School District and Community Youth Services, which is the delinquency prevention component of the Juvenile Probation Department.

I work with the Probation Department full time and at the Student Referral Center at Black Junior High. The center serves eight schools within our area. The center is staffed by a full-time counselor-coordinator and a full-time master teacher. The program itself has two components: a classroom, called the "special assignment class," and a counseling component.

Students can be referred to a center in two different ways. First, they can be sent by a school principal or assistant principal in lieu of home suspension. Students referred this way usually stay in the center from 1 to 3 days because no pupil can be suspended for longer than 3 days without a due process hearing. Second, students can be sent to us by a parent or a police officer, or they can come of

their own volition. Students who have been in the center before often come back and bring a friend who is going through similar problems. Likewise, ministers can refer students, as can officers or an individual in the community. In most cases, these students do not attend a class. They come only for counseling and resource information.

We had 967 referrals for the whole of last year. During the last school year, we had 356 students who were referred to the center instead of being suspended home. And 435 students were self-referrals. As well, I worked with another 176 students during the summer.

Funding for the program is through a joint arrangement. The school district pays the salaries of the counselor-coordinator and the master teacher, while as an in-kind contribution the school provides the physical setting and a $1,500 annual budget for materials and supplies to use for the students.

The division for which I work at the Probation Department is funded through three different Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) grants. One of these grants provides personnel, and the other two provide services. We have a contract for family counseling with the Family Counseling Agency in Houston and have set up group homes, foster homes, and temporary shelters for runaway youth. Students who come through our center have full access to all these services through our grants.

With respect to the physical setting of our program, we are housed in two temporary buildings on a junior high school campus. (In fact, although each of the eight centers in the Houston school district has a different physical location, they are all set up similarly.) There is also a classroom where the students attend class while they are suspended from their homerooms. Theoretically, the classroom has a capacity of 15 students; but we have had as many as 29 in it, which creates a hectic situation. Usually, we average about 20 students in the classroom. And in order to be really effective, we try to limit the enrollment to this number.

Our students are suspended for many reasons, most of which you are probably familiar with. Chief among these are truancy and classroom misbehavior, which can range from insubordination to getting into scuffles in the classroom, as well as not paying attention in class. We have a lot of students who are also suspended for smoking and for tardiness. Many of our self-referrals and referrals from other agencies involve family problems and runaways.

We have a multiple-service delivery. The 3 to 5 days for which the youth are sent to us is obviously not enough time to do much good. Therefore, the question we are most often asked is: "What can you do in 3 days?" Mainly, we provide a time-out period. This is time for sitting down with the student, parents, and teachers to see where

that student is -- to determine his strengths so that we can capitalize on them and his weaknesses so that we can work on them, to understand what we can do to change his academic program, and to decide what kind of outside agencies we should go to for a diagnostic evaluation. We also try to meet the total needs of the child -- including food, clothing, or health care. Last year, in the Houston school district, it was estimated that $12 million was lost in school aid because of days missed strictly because of dental problems alone. Therefore, we try to take care of these basic physical needs before engaging in counseling -- which is a very important part of our program. We do individual counseling and group counseling. The individual counseling that we do primarily focuses on crisis-intervention-type counseling. We work with parents also, and with students and teachers as well. For long-term counseling, we frequently refer students to community agencies or to a family service center with which we have a contract. This service is provided free of charge to people we refer.

We also have daily "grief" sessions with students who are in the classroom during a suspension. There are also groups we are currently conducting in different schools; I am running these sessions with a co-leader who is a school counselor. There we work with students who are not referred to the center but are having problems.

Another of our groups has two parts, combining a counseling component with a recreation component. For each session, the students take a field trip and subsequently take part in a group session. In these sessions we use a variety of technques, such as values clarification or those which focus on decisionmaking skills. We also use reality therapy, behavior modification, contracting, and something new that we are starting which entails working with students to set up a program in which they will participate as volunteers. This primarily involves work with the central volunteer coordinating agency in the area. We are doing this in an effort to help these young people develop greater self-esteem by investing their time in helping someone else. As I mentioned before, we also do a lot of work with a variety of community agencies. This is a very strong component of our program, and last year we referred students to more than 50 different community agencies.

Over half of our students are one or more grades behind or have diagnosed learning disabilities. But many of the students have not been diagnosed, and so are not included in that analysis. We feel this is very basic to the problem of suspension. Since these children cannot perform academically, they become frustrated, and thus cause disruptions in the schools.

Most of you are probably familiar with the Colorado study, done in 1972 and 1973, which showed that 90.4 percent of young people who were in the custody of the youth correction agency in that state had

two or more learning disabilities. Likewise, a study in Texas in 1973 of 1,252 children in custody showed that 4.6 percent of them were below their reading level. Therefore, we try to check carefully for symptoms of previously undiagnosed learning problems in our students. If we find them, we refer students to an agency with which we have a contract for a complete battery of psychological tests and tests for different types of learning disabilities. After this, we try to get the children into an appropriate program for remediation.

I know many people are interested in hard and fast data and in statistics on precisely how effective our program has been. We do have some data that is fairly concrete, but much is not. That is one thing with which we are still having a lot of problems, and I have heard other people in the audience say the same thing with regard to their programs.

I think one of the big problems involved in gathering such information is that, although theoretically there is a central recording system for suspensions in our area, in reality no such thing exists. There is also a problem of definition. What we in the center would term suspension many school personnel do not. They call it a "cooling-off" period, or they send a student home to get a parent. In reality, the pupil may be on the street for a week, 2 weeks, or 3 weeks, but these statistics may not be recorded as a suspension. Thus, it has been very difficult for us to see what kind of an effect we are having with suspensions.

We do know definitely that there are fewer home suspensions. We do know definitely that in the areas where the centers have opened there has been a decrease in daytime juvenile crime rates. In some areas this has been a dramatic decrease, simply because the youth are not on the streets during daytime hours. Moreover, last year's annual report from the Juvenile Probation Department showed a decrease in the recidivism rate for students referred for the kind of offenses we would see, such as running away and truancy.

I would also now like to mention one thing which I omitted earlier. Last night a gentleman expressed concern because no elementary school principals or school personnel were represented on this panel. I think his point was very valid, and I want to point out to him and to other interested parties that, in February, Houston began a pilot program at the elementary school level.

A center, based on the same concept as the Student Referral Center, has been opened for six area elementary schools. Children in the fourth, fifth and sixth grades, ages 10 through 14, are referred to this facility for 1, 2, or 3 weeks. These students have problems which normally would mean suspension if they were in junior high school. So the period of time is usually on the longer side and is usually in lieu of home suspension. So far this seems to be a very viable program.

The same gentleman also mentioned last night that someone had told him that he did not feel elementary schools had problems. The truth is far to the contrary. If our efforts at intervention and prevention are to be really effective, we must start at the elementary school level.

I think there are a lot of obvious benefits to a program like the Student Referral Center. As I said earlier, though, I think it is only a stop-gap measure. Students are supervised, they are off the streets, and they are not in a position to get into more trouble. Their work is sent to them by their regular classroom teachers, and students complete it with the help of the master teacher in the classroom. Students also get full credit for assignments completed this way.

I think the youths who come to us are thus often diverted from the juvenile justice system and from the court systems, which are obviously now overcrowded -- which in any case are not able to meet the total needs of these students. Probably the most significant thing we lose by putting kids on the street is the talent and potential many of them have. I think that if we can be committed to helping each student develop his/her unique capabilities, we will be taking a big step towards solving their problems. Thank you.

PRESENTATION BY MR. CLARK

I appreciate the opportunity to be here and share with you some of the ideas that we have been able to implement in Los Angeles. There are three of us here from the district, which I think demonstrates the interest of our administration and our board in these kinds of programs.

I was interested in the comments made by Congresswoman Chisholm this morning about the need for educators to become effective lobbyists. In California, either because of our size or in some cases in spite of our size, our district has been able to function somewhat effectively, at least with the state legislature.

We are large. We cover 710 square miles. We have 435 elementary schools, 75 junior high schools, 49 regular high schools, 6 opportunity high schools, and 4 alternative schools. We serve 722,000 students, although we are going into a court-ordered desegregation plan and so are not certain what our enrollment will be in September.

The concept of opportunity education was originated in 1966 by the staff of our district. We developed a task force that did some research and was concerned essentially with preventing drop-outs. Our intervention with the legislature resulted in some changes in the program scope, which provided for enrollment of 16- and 17-year-old

students in regional occupational centers in lieu of continuation education classes, authorization to establish opportunity classes at schools, clarification of the purposes of continuation education, alternative programs to be used prior to the suspension of pupils, elimination of detention-type schools, and, perhaps most importantly, financing of opportunity education by the levying of a permissive override tax.

The override tax was 10 cents on the dollar, and in our district, one cent equals $1 million. So we realized a rainfall, but only for a short period of time. By 1974, the legislature passed a new act, Senate Bill 90, which eliminated our override taxing and gave us the same funding for our students, but put our dollars in the general fund. So those of you who are involved with finance know that you have to get in there and fight for every penny from that general fund. We have been fairly successful in doing this.

In the spring of 1974, the opportunity education program was moved to a newly created branch, the Educational Options Services Branch. Other programs in that branch are alternative and year-round schools and, when I use the word alternative, I really mean K to 12 open structure kinds of schools. (We get into that problem of terminology as well.) We have 41 continuation education schools, opportunity high schools and centers, opportunity transfers (which are also alternatives to suspension), the permits-for-transportation program (which is a part of the board-student integration plan), and the community-centered classroom, or Tri-C, a storefront operation serving the needs of expelled youngsters.

COPE, Contractual Opportunity Programs Education, actually got started in September of 1974 and serves grades 1 through 9. One of the important factors with respect to the program is that there is a contract, and that contract exists between the local school principal and the area superintendent. The local school principal must convince the area superintendent of the soundness of the program that is to be offered, of the fact that the faculty has been involved in it, and of the fact that parents have also been involved in the development of the program.

COPE emphasizes education, particularly individual instruction, guidance, counseling, and tutorial assistance as these might be needed. The program came about for a variety of reasons on account of parents, students themselves, office referrals, attendance records, absenteeism, opportunity transfers, administrative requests, increased expansions, vandalism, arrest records, and gang activity.

The mission of Project COPE is to provide each individual pupil, according to his or her needs, with additional services for positive, attitudinal, social and academic growth while he or she is still enrolled in the larger comprehensive school. It is a preventative

program for early diagnosis of problems, and serves as a model of methodology for the entire school.

Our goal is to enable eligible pupils in grades 1 through 9 to resolve their learning and behavior problems and to return to the regular assigned classes. Opportunity education is designed to develop and evidence a positive self-image for the student, to help that individual develop and display a sense of responsibility toward self, school, and community, to develop positive ways of adjusting this student to his or her environment, and to provide success in academic work and in behaving in a socially accepted manner. Our program is a training model for school personnel to help modify student behavior and to improve the educational climate in their schools. Placement of pupils in one of the programs is determined by many factors, including the severity and the nature of the problem to be resolved, the age of the student, the openings available, the extent of the assistance required, the probable period of time necessary to effect a satisfactory adjustment, and parental preferences.

We have not, as a central office, encouraged any individual school to utilize any particular kind of behavior modification. So many different kinds are used, including reality therapy, values clarification, and so forth; several approaches can be utilized properly in providing instruction in the COPE room. Affective education may also be incorporated in the curriculum for the utilization of various methods.

Overall, our criteria for success and objectives for the students are: to improve self-concept; to increase interests and provide opportunities for students to develop their talents; to encourage them to participate in groups; to encourage them to accept responsibility; to improve team-building skills and communication skills; to improve their school attendance and to increase their efforts to succeed; to increase their acceptance of authority; to increase their skills for conflict resolution; to help them adjust to their environment; to increase their knowledge of all human behavior, both acceptable and unacceptable; to prepare them for independence; to increase their self-control, self-motivation, self-evaluation, and self-confidence; and finally, to help them acquire some skills for academic success, as well as for successful social behaviors. The program also provides important staff benefits, establishing a clearly defined procedure for pupil referral placement, rehabilitation, instruction, and follow-up.

An annual review is conducted by each school involved in the program. The COPE teacher, the principal, the parents, and the students complete the review and submit it to the area offices and through the area offices to the central staff. Although this is not used as a rating scale by our office, it is so used by the area superintendent to determine whether or not a given school is using the resource as effectively as possible.

The referrals to the program are made by the classroom teacher or teachers, by the school or area counselor, by the school administrator, by health personnel, by attendance personnel, or by parents. Actual placement is recommended by the school placement team, whose membership may consist of a variety of individuals as long as it includes a standing committee of the administrator, the teacher of the opportunity program, and the referring teacher. We recommend such auxiliary committee members as health personnel, attendance personnel, counselors, and deans.

Are some students still suspended from school? Yes. Unfortunately, this does occur, but just last week I was told by the principal of a large junior high school, which in years past served a highly affluent Caucasian neighborhood and now is a naturally integrated school, that his institution's out-of-school suspensions were reduced by 57 percent in the previous year to 2 years. The principal is convinced this occurred because of the quality of the opportunity program in his school. We would like to think that is true.

Let me make a comment about the source of the funding. When we lost our override tax funding, the district picked up the cost itself, and it is not insurmountable. The district provides 240 "off-norm" teaching positions, at a cost of almost $5 million, so that we can provide that many teacher positions to schools. We provide one teacher for every junior high school, or 75 positions, and 165 positions for 435 elementary schools. Obviously, we cannot meet all the schools' needs. In addition to using CETA funds, though, we have a CARD Program (an acronym for Concentrated Approach to Reduced Delinquency), and the only difference involved here is the source of funding.

A position is given to the school, and as I said, the school principal, the teachers, and parents then develop a contract for the type of opportunity program they will offer. We suggest five options. One is a self-contained program designed for students who exhibit chronic behavior patterns. This is on a 3-hour basis, which is the minimum school day provided for the Education Code, and is limited to 12 students at any one time. The youngster could be assigned to the program for as little as 1 month or as much as 1 year.

Option two is a modular program designed for those students who exhibit less severe behavior problems. It is less than a 3-hour program, and the student can be assigned for 1 month to 1 year; the maximum number of pupils participating at any one time is 12.

Option three combines the previous two options and is probably the most popular of all the programs because it allows flexibility. (I point out to you at this time that very few youngsters are in option one because it is felt that only extreme cases need to be assigned to that type of an option. It is far better for a youngster to

be a part of the regular school and to be provided special attention in the COPE room.)

Option four is a referral program, a cooling-off kind of a program, and I am happy to say that very few of these exist. In some cases, however, schools have been very creative in the use of their financial resources so that they have established an additional teacher position, which enables them to have a referral room and a COPE room.

Option five is a program which would be developed by the school in conjunction with the area office. I should point out that, as far as marking is concerned, students receive full credit for all assignments completed in the opportunity room. The opportunity teacher assigns all work to the pupil during the placement in the opportunity room, and, as in option four -- the referral -- the referring teacher provides the assignments that will be carried on in the school.

We emphasize curriculum heavily. We give all schools an opportunity education guideline book which has a new section dealing with curriculum, providing for different kinds of classroom activity utilizing affective education to get at cognitive abilities. There is also parent involvement. For the youngsters cannot be assigned to the program unless the parent agrees to it. The parent is involved in the intake session and is constantly kept abreast of the student's success by both formal and informal means.

We feel that the number of out-of-school suspensions across the district has dropped. We would like to believe that at least part of this decline has been due to the COPE Program or other kinds of alternative education programs which our branch coordinates.

We feel there are five ingredients necessary for the success of a COPE Program. There must be administrative involvement, interest and support, as well as an excellent teacher. The very best members of the staff should be selected. It is also crucial that the faculty support the program and become involved in it, and a team approach should exist; the teacher of the COPE room, other teachers on the faculty, parents, agencies, and outside resources from the central office and the area office should work together to implement the program. And finally, the program must include a very basic element of education -- respect for the individual student. Thank you.

PRESENTATION BY MR. CROSBY

First, I would like to thank Dr. Garibaldi for inviting me here and for thinking enough of our program staff to include us in this conference. Second, I would like to invite all of you to come some

day to the big city of New Orleans and view our fabulous Superdome. As you know, we like to consider "the Dome" the eighth wonder of the world. Those of you who are from the Houston area, please do not take offense, but we can put your Astrodome inside the Superdome. It is a sight to behold. Do I seem to be bragging? I am.

Getting down to the serious business of this meeting, our Suspension Reduction Program began during the 1974-75 school year. In the state of Louisiana, prior to 1974-75, Jefferson Parish suspension rates were very high; in fact, they were second only to Orleans Parish. More specifically, our heaviest concentration of suspensions was in the middle schools, consisting of the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. Our needs assessment survey determined that suspension was the number two priority in the system. (Reading and math was number one.)

Our Special Projects Department then began work on a project to reduce those suspensions constituting priority two. The department developed the program we are now implementing -- the "intervention room" concept, which attempts to get a suspended student back into the classroom.

The goals of our intervention room are simply these: to keep children in school and to reduce disruption of the educational process. It also provides an opportunity for students to gain insights into the nature of their problems, and it provides schools with an alternative to a negative response to intolerable behavior.

Instead of suspending a child, the principal or administrator has the option of using the facilities of the intervention room, for which we have established five purposes. It provides a constructive alternative to suspension and an immediate resolution to classroom behavior problems. It provides the teacher with a constructive approach for dealing with classroom disturbances, and a cooling-off period for those students who have temporarily lost self-control. Finally, the intervention room provides a therapeutic setting for those students who are experiencing school adjustment problems.

One of the most vital aspects of our intervention room is its utility as a preventative measure in specific situations. We often find a student who may have difficulty dealing with one teacher. Were this to continue under normal procedures, the student would eventually be suspended, even though the student may not be having difficulty with other teachers. The option of sending this student to the intervention room during this one class period (until the problem is resolved) allows him or her to remain in school and attend the rest of his classes.

The staff of the intervention room includes a social counselor and a teaching assistant, who has at least a high school degree and

who keeps records and provides tutoring services. We also have a social worker who supervises the intervention room; this individual's counselor is primarily responsible for counseling students according to the reasons for their referral. If a student is to remain in the intervention room for more than a few minutes, he is allowed to do work on classroom assignments with the help of the teaching assistant. In some cases, the teacher may have to go to the pupil's class and get his or her assignments. If regular assignments are completed, other materials are provided for the student so that his time is used constructively. These materials take the form of socialization activities designed to assist the student in improving his interaction skills.

The social counselor keeps teachers and other personnel informed of the student's progress, while the social worker helps pupils with behaviors indicating the need for more intensive therapeutic intervention. The social worker may also give individual counseling to the child or his parents until the problem is solved. In the beginning of our program, we had three intervention rooms; now we have five. We have been in operation now for 3 years.

Principals and/or assistant principals determine which students are referred to the intervention room. Some principals wanted to have teachers refer students directly to the intervention rooms. I know this thought may now be crossing your mind: "Hey, teachers can abuse this practice." And in fact they can abuse the privilege. So we have an understanding with the principals that if this should occur, they are responsible for taking the necessary action.

Usually, students who are referred to the intervention room have been disrupting their class to a marked degree and have not responded to the teacher's usual attempts to handle such behavior. The social worker also refers to the intervention room students with whom he or she is working; such assignments are made according to assessments of the students' immediate needs.

The facility we use is a classroom; we prefer to have the classroom near the principal's office, but this is not always possible. In this classroom we have the social worker, the social counselor, and the teacher's assistant. The room is also equipped with a telephone, so that parents can be immediately contacted when necessary. The social worker also has her private office, usually near the principal's office, where she can conduct confidential interviews with students and parents.

Our source of funding for the program comes through the Emergency School Aid Act, and the total cost for operating the intervention rooms is $209,629. (Most of this money goes to pay staff salaries.)

In 1973-74, the year prior to the operation of the ESAA program, there were 1,168 minority suspensions in four of the five middle schools in which we currently operate. Last year, 1976-77, there were 839 minority suspensions in those same schools, constituting a reduction of 28 percent since the inception of the program. We like to think that the intervention room had something to do with this reduction.

I would, however, also like to point out the following fact. In comparing our suspensions from 1975-76 and 1976-77, we found that we did not reach our projected goal of reducing minority suspensions by 15 percent. But in this regard, our statistics do indicate that in schools we are not servicing this rate went up 29 percent, whereas in schools we are servicing it rose only 2 percent. So we do see significant success, even though we did not reach the goals we had projected to the Federal Government.

In order to have an effective intervention room, we need a staff comprised of a social worker, teacher assistant, and social counselor who are people with talent and who can deal with the situations. Administration must give its wholehearted support. Teachers must understand the room and use it wisely, and parents must be involved. We provide in-service training for our social workers and social counselors. And after they have received this training, the social workers in turn go into the schools and give in-service instruction to teachers whom the administrators feel could benefit from it. We have used the Tulane Education Resource Center for training social workers, and we have used the materials of the PASS Program. John Kackley from PASS has helped to train our teachers and our social workers to go into the schools and assist us in training teachers who need help with behavioral problem students.

SESSION III

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

DR. BLANCHARD: Our panelists have presented some practical solutions to the crisis in education as it relates to school suspensions. Their remarks will enable educators to reexamine the problems, the programs, and the processes in their districts so as to respond better to the needs of those students who are being suspended.

At this point I would like to open the forum for discussion. For the benefit of those who are taping, please identify yourselves and your school district or your agency. And please indicate to whom you're directing your question.

MS. BOYD: My name is Alice Boyd. I am with the Office for Civil Rights, Region V. I would like to know how many of these programs somehow categorize their students under special education. Most of what I have heard seems to indicate that you deal with children who have learning disabilities or emotional problems and would therefore qualify for special education services.

MR. CROSBY: In Jefferson Parish, we have programs dealing with the special education student, but a special education student may also be referred to our room. In addition, we have special programs to serve the emotionally or physically handicapped.

MR. CLARK: We have the same operations. It is impossible, particularly at the lower grade levels, for a youngster who will subsequently be identified as qualifying for special education to be part of a COPE room. But if that teacher or program does not prove to be successful, and testing follows, very often the youngsters will be moved into the educationally handicapped class or into whatever class is most appropriate for him or her.

MS. PINKERTON: I would only add too that, in Houston, we have a situation just like those Mr. Crosby and Mr. Clark have described. Often programs overlap. In other words, students we see are also receiving special help in other classes. Sometimes students who come to us are not receiving that help, so we refer them to the appropriate people for identification and placement into the proper program.

MR. JACKSON: My name is Douglas Jackson, associate legal counsel, D.C. Public Schools. My question to the panelists is: Does an alternative to suspension mean in essence an alternative to the due process rights of the students? This is very important because, if you are providing some kind of alternative process to suspension, it seems to me you should also provide the necessary alternative procedures for the parent and the child at least to explore the substance of your alternative suggestion.

I am wondering whether or not the panelists, in their various programs, have incorporated any kind of process by which the parent and the child can fully explore the different kinds of alternatives to suspension?

MR. CROSBY: I speak for Jefferson Parish again. Before a student is sent to the intervention room, the teacher has taken the necessary steps. She has discussed the problem with the student, verbally reprimanded him/her, and conferred with the parents. She has used up all her means. Thus, when she can do nothing else, she refers the student either to the room or the principal's office, and, in turn, the principal sends him to the intervention room for counseling.

As I stated before, we have a telephone in the intervention room, so that contact can be made with the parents; and if a conference is needed, the parents are invited in to discuss the situation with the child. If the parents cannot come in -- or if the offense is serious enough and the parents cannot get to the school then -- we place the matter in the hands of the social worker, who has the authority to go out into the community and meet with the parents. Now that is about as due process as we can get.

MR. CLARK: As I mentioned, in our COPE Program, if a youngster is referred by the placement team to a COPE room, the parent is involved. And the alternatives are discussed with that parent. The parent actually visits the room, finds out what it is about, decides for him or herself if this is what he or she wants for the child, and then agrees that the child can be so placed. There is constant contact, once the child is in the program, with the parent, both formally and informally. Progress reports are sent home frequently, sent also to the referring teacher, and, when it is appropriate for the child to leave the COPE room, another conference is held to notify the parent of that action.

MS. PINKERTON: The situation in Houston is probably very similar. If a student is referred to the Student Referral Center, his or her going is entirely voluntary. The student can refuse to come, or parents can refuse to have their child participate in the program. Both those things have happened. At that time, a student is referred back to the school administrator who referred him/her to the program, and some kind of an alternative is worked out.

In those cases, usually, that means home suspension. After 3 days the student then has to have a due process hearing, but as in the case with the other two programs, we are in constant contact with the parents during the time the student is in the center and before the student leaves the center. At any point, the student can leave the program.

MR. GORDON: The parents are immediately notified when the students are placed into our center. And when students are placed in my room, I take it upon myself to visit most of the homes -- even if I have to do this at night, during the lunch period, or on Saturday or Sunday. I feel our program has been very effective precisely because we work closely at all times with the parent.

MR. PERILLO: My name is Pasquale Perillo. I am with the Intercultural Development Research Association in San Antonio, Texas. I am interested in knowing from the panelists if any of your programs -- or others with which you are familiar -- have considered some of the special needs of language minority children.

MR. CROSBY: Again, we have bilingual programs in our system: Vietnamese, Indian, and Spanish. So we have considered the needs of language minority pupils.

MR. CLARK: Likewise, we have a bilingual program that is utilized in the COPE rooms along with the regular program. And, as I mentioned, most of the youngsters are in COPE and also in the regular program. We also have a wide range of instructional materials in a variety of languages. But we probably could do more in this area than we presently do.

MS. PINKERTON: In Houston, as probably in L.A., we have a large number of Mexican-American students. In our student referral program we do not emphasize this particular aspect. I do think it is a problem, though, and we are very conscious of it. The basic language problem seems to contribute to the high percentage of dropouts among Mexican-American students. If we feel that it is a problem, we try to address this need, as much as possible.

In the Houston school district there are also bilingual programs to which we refer some students. Two alternative schools primarily serve Mexican-American students emphasizing heritage culture.

MR. GORDON: Well, as you know, in Chicago we have a problem of trying to integrate our schools in order to get that Federal funding. We invite the whites to come over, and we want the Latinos and the Indians too. But right now our school is 100 percent black.

MR. GARDNER: My name is Trevor Gardner, and I am from the Project for the Fair Administration of Student Discipline. The question I want to ask takes into account the reports we have had since last night. These seem to imply that suspension is the problem not only of the student, but also of the school, and possibly of the administration, staff, and community.

But the responses we have had regarding strategies and models that seem to respond to the question evidently suggest that the burden and the responsibility for personal improvement is on the

student. My concern is, then, about whether any consideration has been given to the possibility that the problem, in reality, may also reside in teachers, administrators, or communities? And if that is true, what sorts of in-school alternatives are considered for these constituencies?

MR. CROSBY: As I have already stated, you are right, absolutely right. Look, I am on your side. I mean I am trying to keep those children in school, and I realize it is not always the students' fault. I realize that. And that is why we try to provide teachers with in-service training in the form of transactional analysis. Thus, we try to show these teachers that it is not always the student who causes the problem. Many times teachers get up on the wrong side of the bed, and they come to school creating problems. We understand that, and we realize that the children have to suffer.

We meet regularly -- well, if you call perhaps monthly meetings regular -- with our area superintendents, one of whom serves each district, to keep them abreast of what is going on. And if we think teachers are misusing their privileges, we involve the area superintendents. We are trying, believe me.

MR. CLARK: I guess the only thing I can say is that we are trying also, but obviously, we have not been successful. We recognize your point as a significant part of the total problem. We have a rather extensive staff development program within the district and with local colleges and universities.

But, you know, you cannot -- what is that story about taking the horse there and drinking, and so forth? You have to be receptive, and, just as with the student, very often we have to begin to work on changes in attitude before anything can be done relative to improving things from an academic standpoint. And so it is true with the rest of us as well.

And another thing -- I get a little disturbed with programs aimed at solving this problem as far as school personnel are concerned, because it is a sustaining kind of thing. It is not a matter of taking the course and being through with it forever; we have to keep at it constantly.

We are very much involved in bringing to our teachers and to all of our staff personnel techniques such as those of Glaser, Palomares, and others. We are, as well, in the process of providing a locally developed program that is called a "style development program"; this is based on positive approaches to dealing with human beings. We just finished a workshop with San Fernando Valley teachers who are serving youngsters entering our Permits for Transportation Program (which is essentially a one-way minority busing program). Our concern here was that these teachers, as was mentioned sometime earlier, would not

really know how to deal with minority youngsters. Some of the participating teachers sent us evaluations of the workshop. One instructor wrote: "The best possible program I have had in 25 years of teaching." Hopefully, she is going to go out to inspire her classes and her other faculty members as well.

MS. PINKERTON: I think in Houston we have some of those same horses that will not drink when you take them to the water. I think that very often suspension is more reflective of administrator's responses and prejudices than it is of actual disruptive behavior on the part of students.

And as far as the Student Referral Center is concerned, we do not have a massive program going on. Instead, we are trying to change attitudes on more of a one-to-one basis. District-wide, there are several programs working with teachers on such things as affective behavior.

Last November I went to a workshop sponsored by the United States Office of Education. It was a training session lasting for 2 weeks and included people from school districts and from law enforcement agencies, as well as administrators, teachers, students, counselors, attendance workers, and anyone involved at any level in the school district. All these individuals went through a 2-week training cycle to learn different ways of dealing with disruptive behavior in schools. I think this is the kind of program that we should study so as not just to concentrate on the study alone.

MR. GORDON: As I stated earlier, we will take a student out of one class and put him or her into another one. I feel nothing is more important than the welfare of that student. No teacher or any principal is more important than the welfare, development, and especially the learning process of that child.

And I would say this; it is important that the teacher do as the Galileans did: deny himself or herself some of his or her social admiration and spend a little more time with the student. Do not just criticize the student; instead, let us examine ourselves too. We are human beings, we have nervous tensions, we are going to make mistakes; and I think we should take all this into consideration when we refer a student to the principal.

DR. BLANCHARD: Thank you. Because of the length of the responses, we only have time for one more question. Those of you, however, who have additional questions will have an opportunity to talk with our panelist, perhaps during the lunch hour or shortly following this session. So we will take our last question here.

MS. GRAHAM: I am Ida Graham and I am associated with the planning office of the Muskogee County School District in Columbus, Georgia. I

was the former coordinator of the in-school suspension program for that district of 36,000 students. I do not know whether what I have is a question, a comment, or something to which I would like you to react.

Our program involves 16 secondary schools. While we did cut the out-of-school suspension rate, we also went through the due process about which the gentleman was worried. In fact, my program was so successful that the in-school suspension rate increased considerably. I thought that was great, but the Board of Education did not agree. However, the board's reaction did not diminish my enthusiasm about positive effects our program had on students -- for instance, the increase in their academic achievement and their staying in school. Were there similar results in your programs, and have you found that the total number of suspensions has in fact increased?

MR. CROSBY: Well, as I have stated, our program this year did not really meet its goals. But we did manage to keep down the number of students sent home. And we found that keeping the children in school is beneficial; academic scores went up. We had no problems. Our school system did not give us a hard time about our program.

MR. CLARK: As I mentioned previously, our program is really limited to a specific number of individuals (according to the specific option chosen), but one of the outgrowths of the system is the opportunity for the teacher to work with other faculty members, helping them understand strategies and approaches that he or she has found successful so that other teachers can then use these methods in their own classrooms.

MS. PINKERTON: I can only add that, in Houston, I think we have had the same problem that you mentioned. But the figures are, of course, very difficult to give precisely. We cannot tell what would have happened to students suspended in school if we had not been there; we cannot tell whether they would have been suspended home or whether they would have been dealt with in yet another way. But I think we probably do have a greater number of students with needs that would not have been met by methods very different from ours.

MR. GORDON: Well, I think that the in-school suspension is advantageous in our school because it does help the student. And because we can handle many cases within 5 minutes, some of our students have gone back to class before the day is over. I really do not see the need for suspending a student and sending that student home.

DR. BLANCHARD: Thank you. I would like to thank our audience and our distinguished panel for taking part in this forum.

SESSION IV

IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION: A PANEL PRESENTATION

Editor's Note: The following presentations by Richard Nelson of Albion, New York, Roger Scales of Montclair, New Jersey, Thomas Boyle of Wexford, Pennsylvania, and John Kackley of St. Petersburg, Florida, were not transcribed as in the preceding sections. The following are reconstructions of the authors' presentations at the conference that elaborate on the features of their programs.

PRESENTATION BY MR. NELSON

The problem of what to do with students when they have been suspended from regular school instruction has long been a perplexing one. Many studies have shown that unsupervised suspended students take part in increased delinquent behavior and that they fall behind in their school work. Suspension has traditionally been used as a means for control of student behavior, and it has been overextended and abused by many school systems. The reasons for this abuse vary, but they usually have to do with successful means of control.

At Albion Central Schools, we have effectively employed an alternative method of suspension which disciplines the student without removing him entirely from the building. However, this program is, of course, not a panacea; we do still have problems at Albion. And before employing any alternatives to suspension, one must assess the individual community and take actions which it supports or can be convinced to support. Support will not come easily; you will have to push your program locally at every opportunity.

The Albion Central School District is located in Orleans County, an area of villages and open lands characterized by small business, industries, and farms and situated on the shoreline of Lake Ontario in Western New York. The region is influenced by Rochester and Buffalo, being located about halfway between those two cities. The school district is a central one serving approximately 3,200 young people. Over 70 percent of the students are bused to and from home. The racial make-up of the community and school are similar; around 84 percent white and 16 percent black, with a sprinkling of American Indians and Orientals. We also have a considerable number of migrants. Economically, the community is marked by a wide diversity. Of the approximately 10,000 families residing within the county, over 2,000 have an income in excess of $50,000. Almost 40 percent of the remaining 8,000 families currently receive some form of assistance.

Five years, ago, in 1973, the Albion Central Schools were in a state of disorder and confusion. Students were able to skip classes and days almost at will. They smoked on school grounds with little threat of apprehension and punishment. They came to extracurricular events, and sometimes to regular school itself, under the influence of alcohol and illegal drugs. The hallways were gathering places for large numbers, and school property was vandalized considerably. There were constant fights, and a degree, ranging from medium to high, of racial tension was always present. Extracurricular events had been curtailed because of the difficulties that arose from supervision. As one can imagine upon hearing this description, much of the students' potential learning time was wasted in disruptive behavior. Respect for teachers and administrators was low.

In 1974-75, the Board of Education employed a new superintendent, reviewed the existing situation, and instituted a strict discipline policy for the middle and high schools, covering grades 4 to 12. This policy was firm, but fair. Its core was enforcement of rules and support for teachers and administrators in the building. One aspect of the policy was the development of In-School Correction Centers for disruptive students. This was viewed as an alternative means to improve student behavior and actions within the total school setting.

The centers are district-funded and set up at both schools under the same guidelines and with the same structures so as to assure continuity and consistency. The centers are staffed by fully certified teachers. The teacher is a key individual. He must be able to work with difficult children and demand their respect and cooperation. So this is not a job that can be performed by a weak disciplinarian, an ineffective communicator, or a teacher deficient in organizational and planning skills.

Our High School Center is directed and run by myself, the Assistant Principal. I have direct responsibility for the center and monitor it on a daily basis. I am responsible for student attendance and discipline and free to use the center accordingly. If the student wishes, he can be granted a hearing before the Principal, who can rule on the Assistant Principal's judgment regarding placement in the correction room. This is always the case with suspensions.

The teacher at the center supervises each student's behavior and activities. He obtains classwork from the student's regular teachers and works individually with each child assigned there. The student is not penalized grade-wise for time spent in the center, and is allowed to make up missed exams, labs, music lessons, and so forth. The center is viewed as a short-term (usually 1 to 5 days, and 2 on the average) corrective reassignment in which exposure to peers and classroom is lost. Throughout the week, the school nurse, psychologist, and guidance counselor work with the student. Other people who, at times, get directly involved with the students include parents, social work-

ers, legal aides, attorneys, and counselors from the County Youth Program, the Probation Department, and Family Court. The goal of the center is to keep the problem student in school, instead of suspending him. An important aspect of it is that he is made to do school work; the student must keep busy during the period of time for which he is assigned to the center.

A student is assigned to the center by the building Principal, who delegates authority to the Assistant Principal. I normally confer with faculty members, counselors, or other members of staff when necessary. Teachers may suggest assignment on the "Discipline Report" form, but may not make direct placement themselves. Reasons for the corrective reassignment vary. The most common ones include tardiness, truancy, smoking, misconduct, disorderly conduct, loitering, minor fighting, improper bus behavior, and insubordination. Once a student has been placed in the center, a phone call is made to the parents/guardians. If a parent is contacted, a follow-up letter is sent home via regular mail. If neither parent is reached, the follow-up letter is sent certified.

The School Discipline Code is given out to every student and reviewed periodically, but with special emphasis at the beginning of the year. The code itself is not the key to effective student discipline; fair and consistent action is much more important. We try to maintain such action at all times.

A separate discipline folder is established for each student who has had disciplinary action requiring placement in the In-School Correction Center. This file is kept within each building and is not part of the student's permanent record. The Assistant Principal also keeps a file which deals with all student discipline matters. This involves a lot of work, but it is necessary for reliability and reporting.

At the center, the student's behavior is recorded by the corrective teacher. This record is referred to by the building administration in order to assess or reevaluate a student's placement. If reassignment to the center proves unsuccessful, further disciplinary action is considered. A student can be and is suspended from instruction if this becomes absolutely necessary. The major reasons for home suspension include possession or consumption of alcohol or illegal drugs on campus, theft, vandalism, assault upon staff members, or refusal to cooperate in an assignment to the center.

Students who are sent to the center first report to homeroom, where they participate in the opening of the school day. At the end of homeroom, they report to the center. The High School Center is located in a quiet area of the school where traffic is light. It is approximately one-half the size of a regular classroom. There is a student bulletin board, 12 to 15 study carrels, and a carpeted floor.

Nearby, there is a separate bathroom facility reserved for center use. The students are escorted to lunch by their corrective teacher, and they eat at an off-time in the regular cafeteria. Contact with other students is avoided.

Experience has shown that the rate of referrals starts out strongly in September, October, and November and then drops off until March, when it initially picks up and then steadily decreases until June. The percentage of males is about 81 percent, and of females 19 percent. At Albion High School, the largest number of reassignments are for the freshman class, with sophomores, juniors, and seniors, respectively, following.

The success of this program can be measured in many different ways. First of all, attendance has improved. We currently maintain an overall average of approximately 94 percent daily attendance in our middle and high schools. That compares favorably to an average of about 90 percent for New York State as a whole.

Second, although there are still home suspensions, the number has been drastically reduced. We have actually lost less than 1/10th of 1 percent of our possible days of student attendance due to the home suspension of students.

Third, for each of the last 3 years, the district has spent under $100 to repair or replace items lost or destroyed by student vandalism. This figure is low, especially because it includes our 33 school buses, 5 passenger vehicles, and athletic fields and grounds. And our low costs on account of vandalism can be directly translated into financial savings for the taxpayers and the community. The savings also allow us funds -- which would otherwise have been spent to repair buildings and facilities -- for additional programs. Likewise, because of our daily average attendance rate, we receive increased financial aid from the State as well. The maintenance of order within school benefits the students and the program, and aids the district financially.

Generally, our students now attend classes, obey the teachers' and administrators' directives, and devote more time to our activities and programs than they did prior to the institution of the center. Fights are uncommon and racial tension is low. Some smoking still takes place on school property, but it is minimal. The use of drugs and alcohol on school property has been similarly reduced. On the whole, then, the atmosphere of the school is a positive one, where many extracurricular events can and do take place in a safe manner.

The In-School Correction Program is but one aspect of our total Albion Program. We stress attendance because we want our students in school. When they are absent, we go find them. We stress academic achievement; our students must study and take tests. If they do not

do their work or fail to pass their tests, they do not get credit for a given course. If they lack credits, they do not graduate.

We provide a diversity of programming within carefully defined objectives. Upon leaving high school, our young people are either prepared for higher education or ready to enter the working world. We now have approximately eight young people enrolled in our work-experience programs. Three years ago we brought back our young people who had been enrolled in learning disabilities and educable classes at the B.O.C.E.S. Center. They are now enrolled in our high school and are mainstreamed into our programs.

The in-school correctional reassignment center is to be viewed as a reassignment from the classroom. Students do regular school work as much as possible. The major overall goals are to keep students in school instead of suspending them, to alter their classroom behavior, and to continue their regular academic work. To this point it has been more than moderately successful. Our In-School Correction Program is but a part of our total Albion program, but it is a key part.

PRESENTATION BY MR. SCALES

I would just like to give some background information on the town of Montclair for the benefit of some of you who are not familiar with the area. Montclair has a population of about 43,000, and is located about 10 miles west of New York City in Essex County, New Jersey. We are in the northern part of the State of New Jersey, about 10 minutes northwest of Newark. About 6,500 students are enrolled in our public schools from grades K to 12. About 42 percent of our students are from minority backgrounds. We have one high school, which has an enrollment of approximately 2,150 students, two middle schools, and seven elementary schools.

The Comprehensive Guidance Program was conceptualized in the spring of 1975. At that time, a disproportionate number of minority students were being suspended from school, had poor school attendance records, were cutting classes, failing, and dropping out of school. This problem had to be addressed. Additionally, a local PTA Council survey revealed that:

1. Minority parents did not have adequate representation or participation in the PTA groups;

2. Minority parents had poor attendance at parent-teacher conferences; and

3. There was a lack of adequate communication between the student's home and his school, and this was especially

true for those students who were experiencing difficulty in school.

Although we had an adequate regular guidance program, counselors were, for one reason or another, unable to provide sufficient personal counseling to many students, and these students were slipping through the cracks. Considering these circumstances, we felt that a nontraditional guidance program was needed to address the needs of these pupils, and that this would also help to bridge the communication gap between home and school.

The Comprehensive Guidance Program is funded under Title VII of the Emergency School Aid Act and by the Montclair Board of Education. The program in the high school is funded by the Board through local funds, and the middle school program is funded through Title VII funds. The primary objective of the program is to provide counseling alternatives that supplement and extend the traditional guidance system, in an effort to reduce the effects of minority group isolation.

The staff consists of two guidance associates at the high school, three guidance associates in the middle schools, and a home-school liaison person in each middle school. The primary criteria for selection of the staff were: (1) demonstrated ability to relate to youth and their problems, and especially to the minority youngster; (2) experience in working with minorities; and (3) a strong commitment to helping youth in the community. In addition, we expect the staff to be able to develop a team approach to counseling. In each building, the guidance team consists of a regular guidance counselor, guidance associates, career counselors, and, in the middle schools, the home-school person. The team members work together daily and meet on a regular basis to discuss student progress and student and parent concerns, and to resolve student problems. In many of these meetings other school staff, such as teachers or members of the Child Study Team, are involved.

Participants are referred to the program through the principal's office or the regular guidance office. Referrals are made by teachers, counselors, parents, Child Study Team members, administrators, and students themselves. The most satisfying referrals have been self-referrals, where students come seeking help.

Program activities include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) personal counseling; (2) group counseling; (3) peer counseling; and (4) group activities such as field trips, dance groups, talent shows, fashion shows, and so forth.

Camping trips have been one of the most effective activities in terms of providing students and teachers with the opportunity to relate to each other outside of the educational setting. We have taken small groups of students on overnight camping trips over the

weekend and have invited teachers to go along as members of the group. Everyone worked together to set up camp, prepare the meals, and carry out the other necessary chores. Campfire rap sessions took place during the evening, which gave students and teachers alike the opportunity to express themselves freely and to hear others' points of view on various topics. These experiences seemed to foster mutual respect between students and teachers, and the attitude noticeably carried over to the classrooms once the group returned to school. These and other experiences have convinced us that students do want to succeed in school; however, many of them do not possess the confidence and the repertoire of strategies necessary for such success. We try to help them develop these.

Group counseling sessions are geared to helping students gain self-confidence; establish short- and long-range goals; develop positive attitudes toward themselves, others, and school; understand the value of an education; improve self-management skills; accept personal responsibilities; understand the school system; and develop strategies that will help them negotiate the system. This does not mean that we are trying to help students beat the system; rather, we are trying to help them learn how to survive within the system.

Other program activities are planned for parents; these are geared to bridging the communication gap between the home and school and to getting more parents involved in the educational process of their children. The home-school liaison person has a primary responsibility of visiting the homes of project participants and talking with parents about their children's progress in school. Since many of the parents work during regular school hours, it becomes necessary for this person to be able to see the parents after school hours; on many occasions, the home-school liaison person schedules a conference in the child's home at 9 p.m. or 10 p.m. In other words, we try to accommodate ourselves to the parents' schedules. The home-school liaison staff -- and other school staff as well -- also conducts workshops for parents during the after school hours. Some of the workshop topics have been: "The Parents' Role In Parent-Teacher Conferences," "Understanding Problems of Students at Home and at School," "Parents and Student Rights," "Financial Aid for College Students," "Information on School and Community Programs," "Parents' Role in Public Education," and "Helping Students to Develop Good Study Habits At Home."

We are also involved in planning activities for students and for parents in conjunction with community agencies. The community agencies in Montclair have been very cooperative in supporting our efforts and very effective in helping us to plan and implement program activities.

Students are referred to the program for various reasons; these include: poor attendance, violating school rules, cutting classes, personal difficulties at home or in school, and other problems that

might interrupt academic progress. Students referred to the program are usually allowed to maintain their regular schedules in school, provided this does not interfere with the regular operations of any class. The length of the students' stay in the program varies according to individual need; whereas some pupils remain for very short periods, others are there for extended periods -- perhaps even for the entire school year.

Many students are referred to the program in lieu of being suspended from school, while others have been suspended from school and are referred upon their return. Our records show that less than 12 percent of the students who have been referred to the program receive subsequent suspensions from school.

We feel that the Comprehensive Guidance Program of Montclair has been very effective in addressing the problem of out-of-school suspensions. We have kept many students from becoming dropouts and have helped others achieve goals which they had previously thought unattainable. However, a few students who have been in the program were not able to survive within the school system; perhaps we have failed those. We shall continue to seek solutions to their problems so that their lives too may be enhanced by an education capable of helping them survive in the larger society; for we believe that the very skills necessary to survival in our schools today will also be necessary for survival in the world tomorrow.

We would be happy to have any of you visit Montclair and learn more about the program.

PRESENTATION BY DR. BOYLE

In 1974, the North Allegheny School System initiated the COPE Program to deal with students who had violated the norms of the schools. The program specifically focused on students in grades 9 to 12 whose behavior included such acts as truancy, fighting, drug abuse and cigarette smoking, and stealing. Although these individuals represented a small minority of the student population, their deviant behavior became so noticeable as to deserve immediate attention.

The reaction of school authorities to students committing such acts has typically been suspension or expulsion from school. Several years ago, however, our administrators realized that an alternative to this trap was needed and that efforts at alleviating student problems would be appropriate. The COPE Program then instituted is an in-school suspension program that utilizes a counseling approach aimed at reducing conformity to deviant peer norms while encouraging the display of acceptable behavior in the school setting.

The COPE Program offers a feasible alternative to suspension. Its purpose is to provide counseling and learning opportunities for hard-to-reach students in order that they may come to view themselves more positively through increased competency in social and academic skills. Every student involved in the center is required to use its programs and to complete mandatory activities.

More specifically, the COPE Program can help students in several important ways. First, in the center's positive climate, troubled views may differ from their own. The supportive atmosphere helps reduce the stigma associated with deviant behavior, so that young people are freer to develop the inner controls useful in reacting to stress.

Second, through a problem-solving model, the program aids students in making sound decisions and accepting the consequences of their actions. To help students act more responsibly, we work at getting them to recognize and change self-defeating attitudes and to discover ways of effectively relating to others; and we provide opportunities for testing and adopting constructive behaviors. The COPE Program also seeks to inform students about smoking, drinking, and drug abuse, in an attempt at attitudinal change. Third, the center provides learning experience in terms of skill development, so that students placed in it may have a measure of success in school. We are concerned with improving study skills and current work on requiring assignments given by regular teachers and with increasing the pupils' awareness of careers related to their particular interests and abilities. Fourth, the program endeavors to increase students' knowledge of various important resources available to them both in school and outside of it: school personnel including counselors, faculty members, and administrators; community agencies which offer special resources for people in need of help; and social and recreational activities which can provide meaningful ways of dealing with frustration, apathy, and boredom.

Students are selected for the COPE Program according to highly specific criteria. On the one hand, we place in it students who have violated the rules and regulations of the school -- that is, pupils who would be suspended. On the other hand, we work with students manifesting behavior that indicates drug abuse, as evidenced by willful use on the school premises, or that has altered so as to influence achievement, attendance, and interpersonal relationships.

During the screening process, the scope of the problem is investigated, and those students who require special help either for severe personality disorders or for drug problems are referred to appropriate psychiatric or medical agencies. In all cases, the coordinator makes the final determination as to whether a student will be admitted to the center.

As well as dealing with the students, the COPE Program attempts to help its charges by working directly with their parents. In this

regard, our objectives are: to provide supportive help for parents and to encourage the use of constructive strategies for dealing with their children; to provide a resource of community services available for consultation; to provide an open line of communication between the home and the school, so that feelings of trust and confidence can be established; and to provide practical group counseling sessions with parents whose children are basically the same ages and have similar problems.

Parents who have students in the center are required to show active involvement through personal meetings with the coordinator. One outcome of the meetings is to insure that the parents' expectations for their children become more realistic both at home and in school. In addition, we hope that inconsistencies in discipline and attitudes may dissipate with honest communication. Overall, parents are asked to form a partnership based on communication and involvement with the school; this may help to redirect the deviant behavior of the children in the program.

The baseline data gathered after a 1-year period indicate that, of the 175 students who were suspended from the regular classrooms but who participated in the COPE Program, over 93 percent returned and remained in the mainstream without further violating the norms of the schools. The 7 percent who returned a second time were carefully supervised and scrutinized with respect to their individual problems. And in each case appropriate alternatives were applied. For example, some were referred to mental health agencies, alternative evening schools, job placement and evaluation centers, and other community agencies that could help effect positive changes in their lives.

It is suggested that the lack of success with hard-to-reach youth in school districts may be caused by the traditional idea of suspending or expelling those students whose behavior has been considered objectionable. The COPE Program has accepted the challenge of disaffected youth and has sought treatment alternatives aimed at redirecting negative youth. The use of such specific techniques as peer group counseling, family therapy, individual guidance and counseling, and vocational evaluation have contributed to the overall success of the program.

Schools can become formidable agents of change with respect to three key variables; namely:

1. Early identification of children who are prone to deviant behavior patterns at the upper elementary and middle school levels.

2. Individualized treatment approaches, including changes in the school curriculum to meet the needs of youth.

3. A total schoolwide program in delinquency prevention, with treatment of the family, which may help to bring about changes in individuals who have consequently displayed deviant behavior.

In sum, schools need to find alternative ways of dealing with youth in trouble, and schools should focus attention on early identification and referral of children who may need the special attention of guidance personnel. Perhaps an ounce of prevention in the school is worth more than the pound of cure inappropriately sought in correctional institutions.

PRESENTATION BY MR. KACKLEY

Project PASS (Positive Alternatives to Student Suspension) is now starting its sixth year of operation in Pinellas County, Florida, and it also exists in 26 other states and 4 foreign countries. The purpose of the PASS Project is to provide a sequence of intervention strategies designed to prevent or minimize nonproductive social behavioral acts on the part of secondary students.

Some students get into difficulty because schools have not provided them with processes for coping with emotional pressures, which can build up until inappropriate behavior occurs; this in turn leads to punitive responses from administrative personnel. But many school behavioral problems can be eliminated by effective intervention before punishment becomes necessary. Because punishment may be ineffective and even detrimental, the PASS Program has explored other options.

One of the sequential intervention strategies implemented by the PASS Program is the Time-Out Room (TOR). In the TOR, students have a chance to talk out problems with a "facilitative listener," who helps them forecast consequences, explore alternatives, make decisions, and develop specific plans which frequently lead to more productive behavior in the students' regular classes. Students can either request this service, or they can be sent by school personnel. Deans, teachers, and counselors are encouraged to be alert to potential problems experienced by children in order that early intervention in the TOR may prevent or minimize the seriousness of such difficulties.

Not intended as a punishment room, in appropriate situations the TOR provides a temporary alternative educational environment. The length of a child's stay in the room is determined by the individual circumstances of each case. However, prolonged isolation and segregation from the mainstream is detrimental. An emphasis is therefore placed upon returning students to their regular classes as quickly as possible, as soon as they can develop a plan to resolve their difficulties. Administrators, counselors, and teachers are informed of the progress of students while they are in the TOR.

While the TOR has been very effective in reducing the number of suspensions in schools (30 to 75 percent), certain students needed a more structured and comprehensive method of handling their difficulties and learning more appropriate behavior. So techniques from transactional analysis, reality therapy, values clarification, and behavior modification were combined to develop the "School Survival Course," which is designed for children who have experienced frequent behavioral problems at school.

School can be an unhappy place for youth who experience feelings of frustration and inadequancy. These students with negative self-perceptions come to the attention of educators either when they develop overt behavioral problems or when they withdraw into themselves. Students adopting either response pattern frequently drop out of school psychologically, and eventually drop out statistically. These nonproductive behavior patterns are learned responses and can be changed through positive learning experiences.

The program developed by PASS teaches students that it is possible to survive in school and to receive positive feedback from teachers and other students. The program is 12 weeks long and requires a skilled leader and a time commitment of 1 hour weekly for each group. Students participating in this endeavor have experienced a decrease in teacher referrals for misbehavior and a decrease in suspensions from school.

Many students who were having serious difficulties at school were also having serious difficulties at home, so the "Home Survival Course" was also developed. This course uses the techniques and principles of reality therapy, transactional analysis, and rational behavior therapy. The program is 12 weeks long, is offered in the school during or after regular hours, and can be presented individually or in small groups. The approach is positive; the students are helped to become aware of their own strengths and the degree to which they can control their own destinies. Specifically, students are assigned ways to explore positive alternatives for resolving problems which they experience at home.

Although the course can be beneficial without parental awareness, it is more effective when parents participate in a parent training group or receive counseling from PASS personnel. Most parents desire a good relationship with their children, and some achieve it. However, even under the best of circumstances, parents at times need help in coping with their own children and other youth. The program PASS had developed fosters open communication, a common sharing of concerns, problem-solving, and an opportunity for parents to re-evaluate their own systems of values. Utilizing the techniques and principles of parent effectiveness training, behavior modification, transactional analysis, and values clarification, the program runs for 6 sessions and each meeting lasts for about 2 hours. Sessions are usually sche-

duled in the evening so that both parents can attend. Parents are made aware of the program through the PTA, school newspaper, mail-outs, and word-of-mouth, and a special effort is made to include the parents of youth participating in the Home Survival Course.

Many teachers have not been given experimental learning opportunities which focus upon creating environmental situations through which teachers and students get to know and to appreciate each other. Some students frequently go from day to day without having any personally satisfying experiences with either fellow students or teachers. PASS has designed a 12-week program that helps create a positive environment in which students develop a feeling of belonging. One hour each week is set aside for activities that encourage openness, sharing, social awareness, and personal growth. This is called Humanistic Activities in the Regular Classroom.

The PASS psychologist and/or social worker frequently initiate these programs in target schools. Also, teachers participating in either a Staff Development for a Humanistic School or a Basic Encounter for School Personnel program are becoming experienced in conducting these activities. PASS personnel have developed a descriptive outline of recommended activities which is available upon request.

The student's high school years may provide the last opportunity for him to participate in a guided group-interaction program oriented toward positive, personal growth. PASS has developed a program which helps students find answers to such questions as: "Who am I?," "Where am I going?," "How do I affect others?," and "How can I become a more effective human being?"

This facet of PASS, called Basic Encounter for Secondary School Students, runs 12 weeks and meets once a week. Each session lasts 2 hours and can be held either during or after school; in these meetings, developmental group counseling and other applied behavioral science techniques are used. One person talks at a time, everybody listens, and no one insults anyone else, so that effective levels of communication may be established and a positive emotional climate may be maintained. Students are introduced to the program through classroom visits by the PASS psychologists and social worker. Although participation is voluntary, some students have been encouraged to participate by administrators, deans, counselors, teachers, parents, other students, and community agency personnel.

A Basic Encounter for School Personnel program was also begun at the request of teachers and administrators who expressed a desire for a guided group-interaction program similar to the basic encounter program for students. These educators indicated an interest in exploring their attitudes and perceptions about "who they were," and "where they were going."

Participants meet once a week for 12 weeks, and the 2-hour sessions are held after school. Values clarification, transactional analysis, and other applied behavioral science techniques and principles are used to provide each participant the opportunity to serve as a unique resource of his own perceptions. The sessions are designed to facilitate positive interaction, with an emphasis upon promoting mutual respect and caring. Teachers and administrators also acquire knowledge of certain strategies for use in their classrooms and offices; they learn to develop a facilitative atmosphere which helps students become more accepting of themselves and others.

While the student population in Pinellas County has increased to the extent that most high schools are on double sessions, the explosion of knowledge has pressured us significantly to expand academic programs. Although most system variables have reached new magnitudes, the sense of purpose, feelings of personal worth, and opportunities for personal growth experienced by school personnel and students have lagged behind; many school employees have become strangers to their co-workers and students. For these staff members, school has become an unhappy place. Thus, a critical need arose for a Staff Development for a Humanistic School program.

Persons in this program evolve more effective communication systems by participating in nonthreatening activities which emphasize positive verbal expressions. These programs are either scheduled as 1-day workshops or as seminars which continue throughout the school year. Because the cooperation of each staff member is necessary to effectively humanize the school setting, these meetings are open to all school personnel. Administrators, teachers, counselors, secretaries, custodians, paraprofessionals, and lunchroom personnel who experience mutual respect and collaborative involvement can create a humanized, caring school that meets the needs of today's youth.

Many teachers and administrators also felt that they needed additional techniques for understanding and modifying their own behavior and the behavior of their students. They wanted a way of turning "losers and spinners" into winners; of stopping destructive "games" and to become caring, supportive human beings. Transactional Analysis for Teachers was the logical outcome.

This is a 16- to 20-hour experimental course of study usually done in eight 2-hour sessions. On a regular basis, teachers have an opportunity to learn transactional analysis techniques, apply them in school and at home, and share the outcome with other participants.

They learn to enhance themselves and others, and how to turn teaching and learning into positive, creative experiences. PASS personnel have developed a workbook for teachers and a leader's guidebook. The program can be conducted by a psychologist/social worker/guidance counselor, or by others who are willing to do some

reading and learn the basics of transactional analysis. All the techniques mentioned above can very quickly be taught to appropriate school personnel.

Project PASS is unique in that it does not just focus on student problems and changing student behavior. Instead, it offers school personnel a chance to examine their attitudes and ways of interacting with students, parents, and fellow teachers and to make adjustments which will allow their work to become more satisfying and meaningful.

SESSION V

DISCIPLINE, SUSPENSION AND ALTERNATIVES: AN OPEN FORUM

INTRODUCTION BY DR. PINK

Let me just make a comment before introducing the members of the panel. From what I have heard in the day and a quarter of discussions that we have had so far, I would conclude there are perhaps two major issues facing us. One clearly is defining the problem, that is, getting to the ideology of suspension per se. Another obvious issue is translating the outcomes of those actions into policy, whether that be at the Federal or local level.

Now let me introduce to you the people who are here on my left. The first of them is Dr. Jerry Morris. He is the Assistant Director for Educational Issues of the American Federation of Teachers. The second person to my left is Dr. Boyd Bosma from the National Education Association. He is a human relations specialist. The third individual here is Dr. Crystal Kuykendall, Director of Urban and Minority Affairs for the National School Boards Association. The fourth person on my left is Mrs. Jean Dye, Vice President for Legislative Activity for the National Parent Teachers Association. And last, but certainly not least, is Dr. Paul Salmon, Executive Director of the American Association of School Administrators.

Clearly, we must present people in some format and some order. So to show no favoritism, the associations have been ranked alphabetically. So I would like to call on Dr. Paul Salmon to speak first.

PRESENTATION BY DR. SALMON

Thank you. It is with some trepidation that I undertake to speak at this time, because I have not participated in the conference until now and may therefore fall some into traps.

The American Association of School Administrators is a policy-based organization. We have a delegate assembly that adopts the policies that sustain us. We also have an executive committee that reviews these policies and accepts or vetoes them. (If the committee's decision is to veto, then the membership has the right to a referendum which makes the final determination of policy.)

We have policies that I believe focus strongly on suspension and discipline, and then we have others that I believe are related strongly to them. But first we approach suspension and expulsion by saying that we view them with great concern, and that we urge our members to give positive leadership in developing alternatives to these practices.

These alternatives must provide environments which meet the educational needs of the students, and they must also provide adequate due process. So in terms of student suspension and expulsion, I believe, from looking at your program, that the American Association of School Administrators is in line with the theme of this conference.

We think, though, that there is more to keeping order in the school than having that final kind of remedy. We are very concerned about child abuse because we feel that, if children are abused, they tend to seek violent solutions to their problems. So we urge our members to monitor all schools systematically for evidence of child abuse. We know that parental mistreatment of children is so pervasive that there is no school that can feel absolutely free of it.

We believe that student behavior and discipline are brought about by a school's climate, and that this environment must be supported by policies and procedures developed to involve school personnel, students, parents, and community leaders. Students who do not comply with these policies and procedures should be confronted with consequences appropriate to their violations; such penalties should be designed to improve subsequent behavior. I believe that we tend to send out signals indicating what we expect from young people, and that we are rarely disappointed in what we get. If we say that we do not trust students, if we establish for them an environment that is hostile and says we believe them to be evil in such a way that they will break the rules if they can, I think we will not be disappointed. If, on the other hand, we establish an environment indicating we believe that young people are good, they will probably behave that way to a much greater extent.

We think that many discipline problems have their roots in the educational program. We think that we do not meet individual needs as adequately as we should; and we urge our members to establish and strengthen programs which speak to such needs and so prevent students from becoming frustrated.

We are very concerned about societal conditions, and we enumerate a number of those that we believe our members should work on with community groups and larger organizations such as the National Council of Parents and Teachers. Our list includes acceptance of violence in our everyday life, addiction to drugs, narcotics, and alcohol, increased teenage suicide and other mental health disorders, deteriorating family structures, parental absence from the home, child abuse, unemployment, excessive television viewing, and unhealthy nutritional habits. We think all of these have an effect on the school, and that whoever tries to change behavior patterns in a school must be aware of this fact. The behaviors that students manifest have their roots in many places, and these roots must be sought out if the problem is to be solved.

PRESENTATION BY DR. MORRIS

First of all, I would like to say something about the AFT's policy on suspension. In this matter, the national AFT generally does not have a specific position. Rather, attitudes toward suspension are taken by local affiliates -- depending on local conditions, attitudes, and so forth.

Although we have adopted some resolutions in conventions, these still do not amount to a broad, comprehensive policy. However, statements made by Al Shanker constitute exceptions, as do certain resolutions involving the Supreme Court decisions affecting suspension. Initially, these decisions were not well received in our organization, but over time many members have come to accept them.

With regard to alternative schools, alternative arrangements within schools, or separate alternative schools as means of dealing with suspension problems, the AFT is very supportive. We feel that such alternative programs are quite valuable. Alternative school arrangements are seen as a way of removing disruptive students from the regular classroom, so that its activities can proceed smoothly; but more importantly, these programs provide a way of dealing with the individual problems of disruptive students, of concentrating resources such as counseling in a program designed for particular student needs. This concentration of resources is very beneficial in terms of dealing with the underlying problems.

I would say that alternative programs are one of two approaches which receive a great deal of discussion. The other approach is that of focusing more attention on the early grades and trying to stop learning difficulties while the student is still very young; it is at this time that such problems are first detectable and can be dealt with most effectively.

In attempts to test various alternative measures, some locals have, in fact, even negotiated into their contracts provisions which call for either studies of alternative programs or pilot programs. I think many of these efforts have gone by the board as a result of recent budget cuts and financial difficulties in school districts, but in at least three locations alternative programs are included in collective bargaining agreements: the United Teachers of Dade County in Florida, the Chicago Teachers Union, and the Gary Teachers Union.

Before coming here, I called some of our major affiliates to discuss what is going on in their areas and what they think about in-school alternatives to suspension. And as I mentioned before, I found that the attitude is generally favorable in that they see alternative programs as very immediate and direct solutions to some discipline problems. Alternative programs can break the cycle of bouncing a student in and out of class without really dealing with his or her

underlying problems. There also seemed to be a consensus among our local leaders about some of the ingredients necessary to alternative programs, and about some difficulties that may be involved in implementing them. I have reduced the information I received to four points.

First, an alternative program cannot be developed cheaply. The class must be small, and many additional resources must be available, as must a lot of additional support in terms of counseling and special programs. The high expenses incurred by such factors may cause difficulties for the many areas that are experiencing financial problems and cutbacks.

Second, before pupils are placed into an alternative situation, they should be screened carefully and intensively. School authorities should be sure to determine just what each student's problem may be and how that can best be addressed. Perhaps the pupil needs more work on reading skills, perhaps he or she needs more contact with adults, or perhaps career training is called for. The alternative program should never be either a dumping ground or a holding place for disruptive students.

Third, there must be a thought-out curriculum which is appropriate to the situation. In particular, removal from a regular class and placement into an alternative program should not be seen as a reward for disruption; rather, the process should involve constructive work.

Fourth, whatever solutions are proposed must involve all elements of the educational community. I think this is true of all programs that deal with violence and vandalism or discipline problems. Unless parents, students, community agencies, administrators, and teachers are involved so that there is a broad base of participation, the program is apt not to be effective. Moreover, the involvement of all these elements reduces duplication and inefficiency.

It is not so difficult to create a model for a program or to design a sensible approach. Indeed, I have received the impression that many approaches work. The implementation of an alternative is primarily a matter of providing attention and materials and making a financial commitment at a significant level -- difficulties often arise with regard to this last point.

So that in brief is the information I gathered from talking with some of our people. I thought it would be of interest to you.

PRESENTATION BY DR. BOSMA

I am Boyd Bosma of the National Education Association. For many years we have been concerned about such problems as suspensions, dis-

cipline, violence, safety, and disruption. In dealing with the specific topic of this conference, I would like to suggest that there are a series of key words that ought to be kept in mind in evaluating all of the proposals that are made. And we should also remember these words as we attempt to seek solutions in our schools, institutions, and community organizations. Among the words are discrimination, disproportion, exclusion, deterrence, and affinity. I would like to try to put those together with regard to some of the history of what we now know as the student pushout movement, and its relationship to this conference.

During the period of school desegregation in the South, a number of civil rights organizations and the NEA saw that each year up to 200,000 black children were being systematically excluded from southern schools as a direct consequence of the failure of Federal, local, and State authorities to provide equitable education in so-called desegregated schools. Children did not have adequate advocates. The NEA was busy trying to develop legal precedents to protect minority teachers and principals against their own exclusion. The civil rights organizations were spending their money on voter rights cases and basic defense, and on achieving simple desegregation.

In 1972, we were able to call a meeting of all of the organizations that were concerned. We defined the problem in a way that I think differed from any previous attempt at definition. We called the phenomenon student displacement. The term now is student pushouts. We used "displacement" and "pushouts" because we felt that a semantic understanding had to take place before we could deal effectively with the institutional basis of the kinds of problems that we were facing. And we knew that teachers across the country were being affected by the same processes as were Chicano children and Puerto Rican children and Indian children and girls and boys in all the other groups that we try to serve in the schools.

We decided that a set of assumptions had to be made. One of these was that, while some kids do in fact drop out, part of the phenomenon was related to institutional causes. We felt we could measure this part if we could have data. And we worked to convince the HEW Office for Civil Rights to start collecting data. Once the information became available, however, and we used it against school districts, some school districts and administrative organizations banded together to stop that data from being released. They succeeded, and, as all of you who have participated in this conference know, the information is still not effectively available to us.

We decided that if we could establish disproportion in treatment among members of specific groups -- racial and ethnic groups, boys and girls, poor white children, and so forth -- or if we could establish disproportion between schools within the same city, between cities, or between states, we could find some measure of the institution's rela-

tionships to pushouts. In the process of looking at this, we found that our estimates of what was happening in the South were probably low. We also discovered that Indian and Chicano children in particular were victims of specific processes that were far more devastating and far more widespread, I think, than most of us had even considered.

In talking with a group of Indians on the Pine Ridge Reservation a couple of years ago, I mentioned that a nearby town in Nebraska with a 30 percent Indian population had just graduated its first Indian in 30 years from high school. And a young man in the audience raised his hand to say that he was that student.

We saw a black high school student in Washington County, Georgia, who was expelled from school at the beginning of the school year for "squealing" his tires in the parking lot, but he was the Student Council president in a desegregated school. He was also the school's biggest football star. The school authorities brought him back to play the last game in the football season and then expelled him again in the next week.

We saw hundreds of young people who were affected by the processes, so we decided that we would somehow have to work on these institutional relationships. By and large, our affiliates have been extremely helpful to us. Teachers do become anxious over the idea of changes, since alienation is a common factor in the schools. But if we can find ways to communicate, to provide participation and input, a sense of ownership in the changes that take place, we can put teachers on a positive track in dealing with the pervasive problems affecting many schools across the country.

The basic issue, though, is still one of exclusion, and the schools have become very sophisticated in their ways of excluding children from education -- from potential opportunities in their own lives and careers. If we provide in-school alternatives to suspension that are only more sophisticated means of excluding them from further opportunities, then we have continued to participate in an evil that will only further handicap our whole society.

During the first couple of days here, many discussions have involved the Goss vs. Lopez decision in Columbus, Ohio (January 22, 1975). I would like to suggest that a more appropriate decision related to that one came through a month later: Wood vs. Strickland in Mena, Arkansas (February 25, 1975). In this decision, the Supreme Court said that school officials who violate the constitutional rights of children might themselves be held accountable out of their own pockets for damages because of the discrimination or the unconstitutional behavior that resulted.

To make sure everyone understands that ruling, I would like to read from a paragraph from it. The Supreme Court said that the official must himself be acting sincerely and with the belief that he is doing right, but:

> "An act violating a student's Constitutional rights can no more be justified by ignorance or disregard of settled indisputable law on the part of one entrusted with supervision of students' daily lives than by the presence of actual malice. Therefore, in the specific context of school discipline, we hold that a school board member is not immune from liability for damage."

The specific point is, I believe, that all school personnel who participate in constitutional violations will sooner or later be held liable for damages occurring when constitutional rights, including the rights to an education, are taken away through exclusionary processes. This liability will eventually reach all of us, including teachers, and we are doing what we can to educate our own members in this respect.

I had hoped to present a number of other principles and concepts. But the basic issue, it seems to me, is that we look at in-school alternatives to suspension in the context of other exclusionary practices that have the effect, not the intent, of discrimination -- not only racial discrimination, but also discrimination against any child who is "different" or who questions the system or who does not conform. Among the modes of discrimination to which I refer are: the standardized testing practices that are so pervasive in all our schools; grading, tracking, and grouping; curriculums that are outdated, inappropriate, irrelevant, and inadequate; inadequate textbooks; inadequate counseling procedures; and other barriers, including actions we see in suspensions and expulsions.

We find, incidentally, in our own experience in research and in practice, that the presence of minority teachers can assist in reducing the level of violence. The NIE's Safe School Study develops some data relating to this principle. But one of the processes I would like to present to you is that, in our changing school system, and particularly in our changing urban systems, the presence of minority teachers may be continually important relative to what I call the indices of alienation in a school. This phenomenon can be measured by dropout and pushout rates, by suspension rates, by low achievement scores, and by problems in teacher and student morale, all of which are common in schools.

If we can find a means of altering the concept so that the students, communities, and neighborhoods feel an affinity with the schools serving them, and if the school climate is made to accord with the needs of the population, we can probably further the process. And

ultimately, we can probably preserve the future of our school systems in many communities, and perhaps we can even preserve the future of democracy in the United States.

PRESENTATION BY DR. KUYKENDALL

I would like to preface my remarks this morning by indicating my pleasure in being part of this panel. I think the issue we are discussing is a very important one, and I would like to take a few minutes to share some insights on policies that have been developed by the National School Boards Association in response to the concerns we are dealing with today.

In looking at alternatives to suspension, the National School Boards Association has developed policies and resolutions which touch on two broad issues. I would like to share both of those with you.

First of all, one of the concerns that has come to our attention is that of students who are labelled "disruptive" for one reason or another. In looking at alternative programs for these "disruptive" students, the National School Boards Association has begun to focus more attention on what schools can do to assist these students, as well as on what schools can do to insure that the rights of these students and their parents (on behalf of their children) are protected.

When one considers the reasons for disruptive behavior, it becomes obvious that we must avoid the development of educational programs or punitive sanctions which could eventually cause more harm than good to students obviously in need of help. We at NSBA recognize that continual disruption in the classroom can have a detrimental effect on the learning situation. Yet we also realize that students who are causing these disruptions quite often have special educational, psychological, and social needs. It may also be that the failure of the schools to address these needs could contribute to the exacerbating behavior. Therefore, we feel very strongly that forced isolation from learning programs through assignment to isolated rooms, suspension, or an expulsion should be used only as a means of last resort.

We have engaged in significant programmatic efforts and have urged many of our members who request our assistance to develop those alternative educational programs for students rather than resort to suspension or expulsion. We feel that, when necessary, state legislatures and departments of public instruction should provide the needed legal and financial support for these alternative programs because many local districts are financially ill-equipped to implement them.

I would like to add special emphasis to the stated need for more alternatives to suspension. We at NSBA feel that alternative in-school programs for "disruptive" students will insure the continued educational, psychological, and social development of the student. In addition, such alternatives will contribute to a noninterrupted classroom experience for students, and in the long run, will enhance the ability of the school to address the often complex concerns of all students.

In attempting to get a clearer picture of the detrimental human effects, the National School Boards Association's Council of Urban Boards of Education created an Ad Hoc Committee on Student Discipline. This committee published a report demonstrating the very damaging effects on students who are forced out of the school experience. The committee supported in-school suspension and more counseling.

I am a bit concerned about some of the comments that were made just prior to my coming to the podium. One of those concerns centers on the court decision rendered in Wood vs. Strickland. We know from our experience with school boards that members are not eager to be sued either individually or collectively. We also know that more boards are cognizant of the increased knowledge on the part of many parents and citizens of school law and student rights. Many of these astute parents are quite likely to initiate legal proceedings against school boards suing for financial damages. Because of this, more school boards are developing policies which will safeguard and protect not only the rights of students, but their own freedom from court-imposed fines or incarceration as well.

This brings me to the subject of another resolution, the one on students' and parents' rights. Unfortunately, we cannot force our members to take any form of action. We can present evidence or possible consequences of an action plan, and we can share research findings. However, we have urged all local school boards, after involving students, parents, staff, and community, to establish written policies on student and parental rights and responsibilities that are in accord with recent Supreme Court decisions and Federal enactments.

We have further urged that all school boards establish due process procedures for the administration of these policies in order that such rights of students and their parents will be protected. The Goss vs. Lopez Supreme Court decision requested that schools more clearly define student rights and communicate these rights to students. At NSBA, we feel the policy of developing guidelines on student behavior, staff relations, rights, and responsibilities is in the best interests of the schools, teachers, students, and parents. Students are indeed our hope for tomorrow and should be our greatest concern. Therefore, adequate procedures for due process in cases of grievances on the part of the students should be established and enforced. We intend to

share with more of our constituents more information on the findings of the Supreme Court, especially the Goss and Strickland decisions.

In a recent survey conducted by NSBA, it was discovered that 77 percent of responding school boards are concerned about the positive image of the public schools. Board members do want the public to have good thoughts about their schools. We all know it is virtually impossible to promote a positive public school image if people feel students are arbitrarily excluded from school through blatant denials of their rights.

At present, the NSBA Council of Urban Boards of Education is developing a Public School Image Improvement Task Force capable of giving school board members some very sound suggestions on how to improve their images and work toward establishing and enforcing policies that will really safeguard student rights and provide alternative programs for deviant and disruptive behavior. This task force will also no doubt look at the school images developed and fostered by antiquated student discipline codes.

We have encouraged local boards to reexamine their student discipline codes. For we realize that some students are being penalized for behavior which is no longer deemed deviant in our more permissive society. The Educational Policy Services of NSBA has provided services to local school boards designing policies which are more conducive to the development of contemporary youth.

We certainly hope that more parents and community members, as well as more teachers and administrative staff members, will work with their school boards in developing those kinds of codes and those inhouse programs that will help students. I personally feel that this is the key to problem resolution. Many school board members are not as knowledgeable about the concerns of their community as they can and should be. We have recommended closer collaboration; for more support and cooperation will not only enhance the school policy, but will also make the school district more responsive and, in the long or short run, improve the image of the public schools and the ability of this society to serve its present and future generations. Thank you.

PRESENTATION BY MRS. DYE

The National PTA is an organization of people meeting children's needs. We are six and one-half million advocates for children. We have been in existence since 1897, and we are composed of 30,000 local units and 52 branches.

From 1977 to 1979, while Grace Baisinger is President of the National PTA, the theme of our organization is "The PTA Speaks Out,"

and the topic which brings us together today, in-school alternatives to suspension, is one on which we ght very logically speak out.

Grace said that, by speaking out on issues which affect one -- and one's children and schools -- the individual and his or her local unit can make the community's PTA a real power for positive action on behalf of youth. During these 2 years, our major priorities include school disciplinary problems and alternative solutions. And, like others who have spoken today, we are especially concerned because there may be a discrepancy in the incidence of suspensions and expulsions; for these occur more frequently among non-white and male students.

In this regard, we are currently drafting a paper updating state positions and procedures on corporal punishment. We are soliciting information from groups such as those represented here. So the outcomes of this conference will be of inestimable value to what we are attempting. At the same time, we are monitoring legislatively mandated studies, such as NIE's Safe School Study. In effect, we are trying to develop a strategy for really effective change in the matter of corporal punishment and in-school alternatives to suspension and expulsion.

I would like very briefly to present my own qualifications in this area. My husband and I have sent six children through high school; in varying degrees, all of them have encountered the problems under discussion here. Speaking for thousands of parents, we would like to see that things are better in tomorrow's high schools than they were when these six children were students.

I have had extensive school board experience at the local level in Cleveland Heights, a suburb of Cleveland, and at the State level in connection with the Ohio State Boards Association. While I was a school board member, the Cleveland Heights School Board passed the first human rights code, the first students' rights and responsibilities policy developed in Ohio. I have, as well, been with the PTA for many years.

Rather than repeat some of the findings already discussed during this session, I would like briefly to state what National PTA has done during the past 10 years relative to the conference's theme.

In 1969, convention delegates approved a resolution on Disruption in the Schools. This committed PTA to finding out the causes and the incidence of disruptions, and the differences between disruptive students and -- here I use the phrase cited earlier this morning -- the pushout students. National PTA was asked to prepare guidelines for the participation of local units and councils in the area of disruption, at all times working with other organizations such as those

involved in this conference. We then produced a pamphlet, Programs to Prevent Disruption in Our Schools, which is available upon request from National PTA, 700 N. Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611, as are the other PTA pamphlets and studies cited later in this presentation.

Another important aspect of the 1969 convention's resolution was the PTA's encouragement of the voting public to support financial resources and appropriate programs for implementation. We knew even then what has since been demonstrated -- that the provision for in-school suspension programs would be a lot more expensive than "simple" corporal punishment. In fact, the literature on the subject indicates that one of the major reasons given for the quick and effective use of corporal punishment is its lack of cost to anyone (as long as there are not liability suits).

In 1975-76, National PTA developed Projects on School Absenteeism because juvenile court judges with whom we had worked had indicated concern over youths winding up on the street and in court after having been suspended or expelled. The problem then, as now, is that every day two and one-half million enrolled students are absent from school. These millions of children lose out on their education, and school districts, not incidentally, lose out on millions of dollars in state aid because of the average daily attendance factor.

As a pilot project during the 1974-75 school year, with financial support from Sears, Roebuck and Company, National PTA conducted a study of school absenteeism in pilot elementary schools in five States. Before I read the names of these States, I should mention that if any of you are from them, it would be to your advantage to get a copy of the complete State programs as well as the final national report. These places were: Colorado, New Hampshire, Ohio, Tennessee, and Utah.

Our purpose was to explore the nature of absenteeism and to try our various techniques to combat it. Out of this, PTA produced a widely disseminated pamphlet, Where Have All the Students Gone?, which gave some of the findings, three suggestions of which I will repeat here. The first was to encourage each school board to develop a clear policy regarding absenteeism, truancy, and suspension and to inform parents of that policy. Second, the pamphlet advocated "that the individual encourage your school to use in-school suspension." Third, it suggested that "expansion of educational alternatives in your school" be encouraged.

PTA has also been involved in a TV violence project which is still going on; and I imagine most of you associate PTA primarily with the subject of combatting TV violence. One of the interesting findings in this detailed project is that excessive TV viewing has contributed greatly to a breakdown in the learning process; the child who,

by the time he has graduated from high school, has spent more time in front of TV than in the classroom is not applying himself to homework. In support of this, the National Assessment of Educational Progress's recent report on the correlation between application to homework and amount of time spent watching television points out that increasing numbers of children are spending decreasing amounts of time doing their homework.

Likewise, our TV project findings also revealed that a child who views a disproportionate amount of television does not do homework, read for pleasure, or constructively communicate with other human beings. But most children do make an almost articulated demand on their teachers that presentations in school be made as exciting to them as television has been the night before.

In 1977, PTA moved on to a report on Today's Family in Focus, a program of parent education resulting in eight brochures, one of which dealt with children's rights and how parents can protect them. We concerned ourselves with the rights of children and parents in matters of school discipline, the rights of children and parents with regard to school records, and the famous Buckley Amendment and guidelines.

In connection with this brochure, PTA posed four questions on school discipline which had been isolated by the Massachusetts Advocacy Center. These are all meaningful: What authority do schools have to discipline children? In what instances can children be disciplined? What type of discipline can be administered? What are the rights of children and their parents or advocates in the disciplinary process?

PTA indicated nine guarantees of fairness to protect the child from the injustices at the heart of due process. We cited such non-obvious points as: the right to notification in writing of the charges against the child, with specification of the regulation which was broken; the proposed disciplinary sanction; the right to be told all the evidence against the child; and the right to a written statement of both the decision and the reasons behind it.

In connection with Today's Family in Focus, PTA issued the Family in Today's Educational World, which talked about the family in the school, parent participation, and proposals for political and financial reform. Its reference to the voucher system predated our current involvement in the issue of tuition tax credit legislation, which threatens such potential damage to the public schools of America. Another important pamphlet put out by the PTA was A Guide for Parents and Teachers on Children and Values.

The National PTA's Commission on Education is currently mandated to do an elaborate study on corporal punishment. This will include such things as the recent Supreme Court decisions and the findings

that are coming out of this conference. At this time, PTA is involved in a project with the College of Human Ecology at Cornell. Under a grant, PTA units have been requested to give input to the formation of Federal policies on children, youth, and families. (This is the first time the Federal Government has asked for such participation on the parts of parents and citizens.) The White House Conference on Families, planned for December 1979, will be partially based on the findings of our present study.

One of the 10 key issues included in this study is that of "Troubled Youth and Youth in Trouble." And the following statements from the study are pertinent now. Although it is not clear whether failure in school leads to delinquent behavior or whether juvenile delinquency leads to failure in school, schools do play a large and important part in the life of youth. And the schools attended by many lower class youth may look more like prisons than schools, and may be poorly staffed and overcrowded. Instruction in these schools simply does not meet the students' needs.

I would like to conclude this presentation by listing several suggestions under the heading of "PTA, the Child Advocate, Believes These Things." The parent must be involved. Schools must develop student codes and guidelines with the parent. These must be reviewed and revised regularly. Policies must be laid down in advance. There must be a procedure through which students and parents are fully informed and reinformed about rules concerning discipline, penalties, and suspensions.

Discipline is far more than corporal punishment. In-school suspension must be developed as a substitute for out-of-school suspension. We must seriously consider and treat the effects of alienation on children and the practices we promote in our schools. We must consider not only their short-term but also their long-term effects.

Schools are learning that children have a right to education which must be protected. And if we consider education to be of real value, then we admit that a suspension out of school deprives a student of something important. In these in-school suspension programs, we must recognize the difference between the disruptive student and the inattentive student.

The literature is full of successful and striking examples of in-school alternatives to suspension, many of which you have heard about during this conference. They have many points in common: a separate room, supervised by an adequate, caring teacher or counselor; an assignment for a specific amount of time, and a requirement that the student keep up with his classwork; the availability of resources for such work; and the monitoring of the student's academic and behavioral progress continued after he has returned to the regular classroom.

We believe that lowering the age for leaving school is neither an appropriate nor a satisfactory answer to the problems leading to disruptive behavior. And finally, PTA believes that the key to effective discipline is the classroom teacher -- firm, fair, and friendly. And these three words or synonyms have consistently recurred in the course of this conference and in the literature. This classroom teacher, though, must be supported by an understanding parent who sends a responsive, healthy child to school. Since the ultimate responsibility for the child's behavior does rest with them, the parents must be part of the educational process from beginning to end; and they must fully accept their responsibility toward the child in his or her preparation for school.

SESSION V

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MR. KUBIK: My name is Ed Kubik and I am from Suffolk County, Long Island, New York. I would be happy to hear from any members of the panel, but I address myself specifically to Mr. Morris and Mr. Bosma.

Do you feel that teacher education, or the educational system we now have for training teachers, is adequately preparing new instructors for the kind of classroom situations they are going to face today?

DR. BOSMA: Well, it has been a while since I went through the training programs, but I think I can safely say that teachers are not being adequately prepared for situations in today's schools. One thing that is happening, however, is that very few new teachers are coming into most school systems, particularly in the northeast.

The average age of teachers is 46, and I believe that, in cities such as New York, it may even be 51. That is surprisingly high, so the image of the young teacher as characteristic of the population is no longer quite as true as it used to be.

In my opinion, we need to find strategies not only for training teachers for realistic responses and for understanding the role of accountability at the level of decisionmaking within the school system, but also to provide the skills that are going to help teachers survive and act effectively in ways that protect the rights of students and themselves. When we become anxious about new and difficult situations and lack the skills to deal with them, we tend to use counterproductive means of response. Teachers get in trouble on account of such reactions; very often, justifiably so. Blame, however, is not usually an appropriate strategy, and I think it is especially out of place in this situation. We need to find ways to build alliances with parents, with communities, with administrators where possible, and with anybody else we can, in order to change some fundamental assumptions about the nature of the system and what it should be trying to do.

DR. MORRIS: I would certainly have to say that teachers are not being prepared to deal with situations that they encounter in the schools. I do not know that this is a new problem. From what I have heard, this has been the case for many years. Teachers find that the information they get from their teacher training institutions does not really prepare them for the challenges they meet in the classroom.

I understand that a number of colleges and universities are developing programs, either as in-service training or leading to a special master's degree, that will provide help in this area. But

most of these programs are very new, and I have little information on how effective they are.

MR. ARONSON: My name is Norman Aronson and I am an attorney from Colorado. I work with a number of cases concerning school issues, primarily defending the rights of students. I would like to raise an issue here and ask the panelists whether or not any of your organizations have addressed it.

The main topic today is suspensions, alternatives to suspension, and the use of suspension as a last resort. The concern -- and I think it is a major concern across the country -- is this. Concurrent with those suspensions, school districts usually impose academic penalties such as the denial of academic credit. I am currently involved in a case litigating this issue with a school district that has denied academic credit to students who have been suspended. The particular policy provides for no more than eight unexcused absences, including those involved with a suspension, and allows on this ground the school district to deny academic credit to the students for the entire semester.

This issue has been raised in other parts of the country. In an opinion issued on this subject for instance, the Court of Appeals for the State of Kentucky found that the denial of academic credit is beyond the authority of the school district when it imposes punishment.

Youth who are being suspended are usually C students or below, borderline students academically, and when schools are allowed to impose academic penalities or to deny academic credit, they are encouraging the dropout rate, the suspension rate, and the pushout rate. Students become frustrated, so they decide to give up and not return to school.

What I am finally asking is whether any of your organizations have taken a stand on the issue of criteria for academic grades -- that is, the idea that grades should be given only for academic performance.

MRS. DYE: This is a very serious problem. National PTA is concerned and will write this concern into its statement now under consideration. Obviously, if an individual who is not doing well in class is suspended or expelled, his possibilities for rejoining his class on the level at which he left decrease substantially with each day he is out of class. Certainly, treating children this way does not make sense.

Earlier this morning, I told someone that in 1969 National PTA realized, with some horror, that this was an aspect of education to which we simply had not paid attention, nor had we heard that many

people throughout the country were considering it. All organizations concerned with the education and well-being of children must deal with the issues that academic performance should be the only measure for academic grades and that serious efforts should be made to keep children from being penalized academically for nonacademic problems.

DR. BOSMA: Both Jerry and I are unsure that our own organizations have resolutions relating to the specific issue that you raise. A few years ago, the NEA had task forces on compulsory education and corporal punishment, which, I believe, became concerned with easing certain responses. We called, for example, for corporal punishment to be phased out in the schools. We think that efficiency and quickness and so forth are not valid justifications in terms of the range of damage that results from corporal punishment. And the in-school suspension, the short-term suspension, and the in-school alternative to suspension may ultimately turn out to be only new and more sophisticated methods of exclusion.

We have also published a document which I believe approaches your issue. If you would like, you can write to the NEA for a little book called What Teachers Should Know About Students' Rights.

DR. MORRIS: The AFT does not have a national policy specifically addressing the question of academic credit during the period of a student's suspension. This is the kind of issue that would usually be addressed at the local level, unless it becomes a very significant national issue -- which could of course happen. On this issue, AFT locals are more apt to adopt a position which addresses the circumstances of their own school systems.

DR. KUYKENDALL: I would like to inform you that, before the development of the NSBA resolution on disruptive students, much consideration was given to the loss of academic credit when children are not in school. This is one of the reasons why we have strongly urged local boards to develop these in-house programs.

Now, with regard to the specific question of loss of academic credit, we have not developed a resolution. Many of our local school boards have addressed this concern, and we do know that our Council of Urban Boards of Education will be addressing the issue in future publications and ad hoc committee reports.

Since this issue appears to be such an overriding concern, I would like to see more of the groups represented today, as well as the many advocates for students and for parents and representative organizations with a genuine concern for students and human rights, take this concern to local school board members. There are still too many community concerns which are not brought to the attention of local board members, who have the utlimate responsibility for the development of those policies which can and will safeguard student rights within their respective local school districts.

DR. SALMON: The American Association of School Administrators' official policy is that alternatives to suspension and expulsion need to be developed and that these alternatives must provide environments which meet the educational needs of students. One of the great benefits we see is that the student is punished for disruptive behavior for whatever reason and is not punished by having his educational progress held back. Therefore, we certainly would not be in favor of withholding academic credit.

MS. HUTTON: I am Charlotte Hutton from the District of Columbia Public Schools, Office of State Administration. My concern relates to Dr. Kuykendall's statement about examining some of the codes in relation to student government and student rights and responsibilities. I am wondering whether, at this time, you are in a position to specify areas of these codes, for the sake of those of us who have already established codes of ethics?

DR. KUYKENDALL: I am not in a position to do that right here, but what I can suggest is this: our Educational Policy Services Division, in conjunction with our consulting services, does provide on-site technical assistance to school districts that are looking at the revision of their discipline codes, as well as basic policy related to discipline or student disruption or student rights.

What I can do, if you write me directly or call me, is send you some of our sample policies and information from our files on what our consulting service has been able to do with school districts. And perhaps you may even want to work directly with that department.

QUESTIONER: I would like to address my question particularly to the union representatives and the administrator, and also to the PTA representative. These people seem to me to be the representatives here of educational authorities in the public schools.

After listening to the several presentations concluding with this one, I am seriously concerned that we might leave here without any perspective on action-oriented activities. I was disappointed because no one made specific citations. I expected these especially from the gentleman representing the American Association of School Administrators. I think Dr. Salmon finesess his approach to the administrative responsibilities. It would seem that there should be more programmatic presentations showing specifically what administrators throughout the nation, from the executive level to the State level and trickling down to the classroom, are doing about what is considered a great problem.

I am further concerned about the relationship between the development of unions and school discipline problems, the impact unions have on the administration of schools and on the lives of teachers, and what implications this has for union leaders when they look at the

question of discipline alternatives. I think to some extent Dr. Bosma tried to address himself to this, but I do not think Dr. Morris did.

We think of funding as a significant part of looking at alternatives, and I would also like to know what ideas these men have about looking at the serious problems of funding for the future. Are there any propositions for legislation?

DR. SALMON: I would like to speak first, because I need to refer to the letter inviting me to make this presentation. My response is not defensive. For although -- and I am not doing this defensively -- I feel capable of doing what you want me to, that was not what the organizers of the conference requested. The original letter asked me specifically to "express the views of your organization on discipline, suspensions, and alternatives through formal policy statements and the general philosphy of the association." I think that the problem we have here is not that the administrators' association does not have alternatives that we can describe, but rather, within the context of this presentation, I did not think such a discussion appropriate. I would now be glad to add what you have asked for, if that is what you want.

We believe that the problems of discipline ought to be looked at in a diagnostic and prescriptive way. We realize that resources are short, so that this cannot be done very often, or perhaps as often as it ought to be done. We think that a wide variety of professional people should be made available for serving the needs of children who have behavior problems. Some of those will have roots in education, some in sociology, some in nutrition, and so forth. We think the administrator in the school has a primary responsibility for setting a climate in his or her institution -- a caring, loving climate, one that is concerned about young people. And we think the administrator must recognize that every day these young people bring to school problems inherent in the enviornments they occupy while they are not in school.

We believe we need to be imaginative in seeking to isolate the schools, and I concur completely with my colleague from the National Education Association, these alternatives should not be discriminatory, but they should be imaginative. And finally, I would like to say that we think that the education of the young person is paramount, and that anything that impedes this education impedes the development of good self-concepts and contributes to bad behavior.

DR. MORRIS: We have several questions here. In terms of plans for action, let me mention three areas in which the AFT has been working.

One of these is improving early childhood education, on which we are placing a strong emphasis. We have put out some materials on

this, and we have been active in promoting and supporting legislation. We think that the learning difficulties which very often lie behind disciplinary problems and disruption have to be tackled at an early age level, and that the resources must be marshalled to do this.

A second area is improving the training of teachers, which was mentioned earlier. We have a policy, for example, in favor of an internship program. I will not go into that except to say that an internship program would be a much more satisfactory way of introducing teachers to the classroom and helping them be better prepared to deal with some of the challenges that they will face.

Third, I would say that the AFT plays a very active role in working to increase legislative support for all kinds of programs. But an interest in alternative school programs has to be placed in the context of other school programs. We find that, in many areas, the school system as a whole entity is being challenged, and school systems are being closed down in a number of states for lack of funding.

During the past couple of weeks, we have gone through a battle here in Washington on the tuition tax credit. Along with the other educational organizations, the AFT saw this bill as a tremendous threat to the public schools. So our interest in alternative schools has to be placed in the context of other concerns.

With regard to the relationship between the growth of teacher unionism and problems of discipline in schools, I would suggest that perhaps there is a spurious connection. I think that, within school bureaucracies, there are a lot of alienated people. We notice that many individuals are finding that their edges are rubbed a little raw by these giant, impersonal institutions. And this contributed to the formation of teacher unions. I think that the same kind of forces have been at work on students. In addition, the forces outside the school that have made it more fashionable to challenge traditional authority than to accept it have had an impact both on students and on teachers. So the spurious connection I have mentioned exists insofar as teacher unionism has been a response to causes similiar to those which sometimes produce student disruption.

DR. BOSMA: I do not have a good way to answer all that was said, but I would like to respond in part. I think I did try to cover your points as much as possible in my earlier remarks.

The experience we have had is that teachers around the country, in all kinds of school districts, are trying to deal with problems which are being discussed here in many different ways. We hope these will be positive ways.

The basic message I had hoped to convey today is that we need to look at the semantics of some of the terms we use and to understand

the implications of some of the processes in which we are involved. For example, it seems to me that the most wholesome approach to discipline problems is to view them as symptoms of the possible need for institutional change and reform, and that the most effective strategies we can find will build toward those institutional relationships, rather than toward changing youth. This may be a trite statement, but I say with complete sincerity that somehow we have to join together, all of us. Teachers need this as much as anybody else -- we want to be loved, too. But we have got to find ways to make schools attend children; so we do not just have children attend school.

QUESTIONER: I have two concerns, one to direct to Dr. Bosma and the other to Dr. Morris. I would like to know how the AFT is being helpful in the planning and determination of alternative programs when at times these require changes in job descriptions or even new personnel not always in keeping with existing union regulations. How are you making proposals to locals and working with school administrators?

And Dr. Bosma, you indicated a very, very serious and continuing issue about institutional racism, and I wonder if you are saying that this problem is much more difficult than it would appear from current presentations.

DR. MORRIS: I would say that, first of all, a number of locals have been active in trying to develop alternative programs, as I mentioned before, according to the feedback I have gotten on this. In a number of cities, it has been very difficult to raise the issue. There was no support from other parts of the educational community. This is why it became an issue in collective bargaining; the locals wanted to ensure that there would be some action.

With regard to the difficulties involved in getting around certain arrangements that already exist, I cannot tell you precisely what goes on. This is a matter of local discussion and accommodation. I think, in dealing with problems such as this, all elements of the educational community have to be involved. I believe that when the teacher groups are approached and are included in the process of development, they are very responsible.

QUESTIONER: I was wondering about your leadership from the national standpoint?

DR. MORRIS: From the national standpoint, we have not been developing specific programs for alternative schools. We provide information to locals when they have a need to know what is going on in other areas, and we have addressed the issue in a number of conferences and workshops.

But as you know, interest in this topic has been escalating, and I think we all have a lot to learn about the issue in terms of what is occurring in various areas and in terms of what seems to work.

DR. BOSMA: The question I heard was whether I view the problem of institutional racism as much more serious than presentations here would make it seem. I hope I heard that correctly. And the answer is, yes, I believe I do.

I think that pervasive racism is not the only destructive mechanism in the system. There are also some other processes on which we have come to rely over the years because they have been comfortable and easy for us and have simplified our jobs as teachers, educators, administrators, and, probably, as parents. When teachers try to get rid of unsatisfactory grading systems, when parents try to get rid of standardized tests, or when we as a group try to provide effective reform ourselves, for example, in planning for school desegregation, we ourselves are excluded from the very groups that ought to be involving us because, in dealing with children and parents in the community, we are on the front lines. And this is too often forgotten.

As a result of being excluded, we sometimes exhibit symptoms of alienation; we become hostile, too. This is self-defeating. We need to find ways to open up the system, to provide effective input and participation. I am particularly concerned that the availability of simple solutions can be particularly conducive to delusions on our part and can be particularly damaging in terms of the efforts of this conference's sponsors, who I think understand these issues, to start a process of change that will help school districts around the country move in the necessary directions.

I would like to cite two pieces of legislation which have developed in the last several years as possible models for us. The standard under Lau vs. Nichols and in the May 25, 1970, HEW Office for Civil Rights memorandum on language discrimination and national origin minorities (which all of you should know and I hope you do) states that the individual educational needs of children constitute the test for the provision of special programs, particularly bilingual, bicultural programs.

It seems to me that it is inexcusable, that it has never been educationally defensible or morally defensible, for us to do less than that in dealing with a student who is having problems. The Florida pushout study of a few years ago was done by the governor's task force on student disruption. After the group looked at the nature of the problems, it became the task force on disrupted students. This is, I think, essentially the root of our problem.

Mary Faber of the NEA is here, and suggested to me before the session that the handicapped legislation, Education for All Handi-

capped Children Act, P.L. 94-142, provides within it that the handicapped children who come under that legislation must have individual educational plans that meet their individual educational needs. I have not yet thought this through, so I am not sure what all the implications are, but I think it is certainly an interesting idea. It seems to me that, if we can avoid the effects of tracking and grouping that have handicapped us so much in the schools, perhaps we might explore the possibility of individual educational plans that really are adapted to students' individual educational needs. And those might become the test.

Yesterday, Sam Ethridge of NEA tried to point out that handicapped children cannot be suspensed in the same way as other children are, because of the protections of the act I have mentioned. It does not seem sensible that any young person should be subject to arbitrary or discriminatory processes if students in any other group can be protected. But if we can find means of limiting our options and taking away those things we know are damaging to children -- and I have listed those that I consider most damaging -- then perhaps we can find real alternatives which put us on a positive track.

DR. PINK: I would like to express my appreciation to the panelists and also to the audience for making this such an interesting forum. Thank you.

SESSION VI

DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING EFFECTIVE IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION

M. Hayes Mizell

Let me say at the beginning that the subject of designing and implementing in-school alternatives to suspension is broad and requires a more extensive discussion than is possible because of the time constraints imposed on this presentation. Therefore, this paper is somewhat sketchy and does not fully develop the many considerations that should be kept in mind in developing in-school alternatives.

During the past several years, the frequent use and abuse by public school administrators of short-term,[1] out-of-school suspensions as a disciplinary technique has come under increasing scrutiny and criticism. A number of authoritative reports at the local, State, and national levels have documented the reasons for such suspensions and the extent to which they are used.[2] The word "suspension" has started to take on a connotation of opprobrium that is an embarrassment to schools rather than to students. The sensitivity of some school officials to the disrepute of suspensions has even given rise to a euphemistic nomenclature which seems designed to obfuscate the practice of disciplinary exclusions. But whether the practice of temporarily barring children from attending school as a response to real or perceived cases of misbehavior is called "3-day removal," "class closure," or "sending the student home for the remainder of the day," the result is still the suspension of students from school.

The current reaction to the widespread use of suspensions has been prompted by a variety of new perceptions, analyses, and pressures. Among these are:

- An awareness that suspending students from school for attendance offenses (truancy, cutting class, excessive tardiness, leaving campus without permission) is an irrational and ineffective disciplinary response which only compounds the problems of absence from school;

- An understanding that suspension is not the most effective or productive response to a range of nonviolent, non-overtly disruptive offenses such as smoking, disrespect, use of abusive language, insubordination, or, as in one school district, "public affection";

- Pressures from law enforcement officials and juvenile court judges who have complained that suspended students frequently

get into trouble in the community when they are unsupervised and uninvolved in constructive activity;[3]

- o A realization by school officials that students who are suspended from school are not counted in the average daily attendance, and that such absences jeopardize a school district's anticipated level of state financial aid (where state aid formulas are based on ADA);

- o Findings that minority students, culturally different students, and students from low-income families are more likely to be suspended at a rate signficantly disproportionate to the percentage of enrollment among all students attending school;

- o An acknowledgment by school administrators that short-term, out-of-school suspension has too often been used as a convenient and simplistic response to a complex set of problems which may be the shared responsibility of school personnel, the student, and the student's family and community;

- o Criticisms by parents and community groups that school officials are abdicating their responsibilities to students when they remove students from school without first using a range of techniques and services to identify and remedy the problems responsible for the commission of the real or perceived disciplinary offense;

- o Experiences that suggest that suspension is not the best method for communicating with parents about the behavior of their children and for enlisting parental support for the disciplinary goals of the school;

- o Evidence that suspension is now so inappropriately used that it is not a deterrent to student misbehavior, that it does not instill self-discipline, and that it does not ensure that student misbehavior will not recur.

As a result of the above and many other concerns, school officials are making greater efforts to develop and utilize disciplinary responses which do not exclude students from school. The generic term "in-school alternatives to suspension" may describe many different kinds of efforts to deal within the school with student disciplinary offenses that would have formerly resulted in out-of-school suspension. Such efforts may be informal and ad hoc, or they may be formal and highly organized, but they are all predicated on a conscious decision not to utilize short-term, out-of-school suspension as a response to certain student offenses. While such a decision may represent a sincere effort to reduce or eliminate out-of-school suspensions, it

should be recognized that the decision also repesents a de facto admission by school officials that they are unable or unwilling to successfully initiate and execute the kinds of preventive instructional, organizational, and management strategies which will minimize the manifestations of inappropriate behavior by students.

The decision to develop in-school alternatives is at least a recognition of the harm and futility of out-of-school suspension, and hopefully it is predicated on an intention to better serve students. But it also means that all of the knowledge, discussion, curriculum, workshops, conferences, publications, and professional rhetoric focusing on the why and how of meeting the educational and human needs of individual students have either been inappropriately applied or have had limited impact in many local schools and individual classrooms. In-school alternatives can be a valuable step toward better meeting students' needs, but they must not be allowed to deter or replace more fundamental educational efforts which will prevent the kinds of behavior to which in-school alternatives are a response.

It is not the purpose of this paper to describe the many types of in-school alternatives to suspension. That information is readily available elsewhere, and school officials who are considering the development of alternatives should make use of those resources.[4] However, just because a disciplinary practice carries the label of an "in-school alternative to suspension," it cannot be assumed that the needs of children are being better served or that it represents a qualitative improvement over previous disciplinary practices. Any disciplinary practice, including an in-school alternative, can be misused, and later in this paper we will set forth a number of criteria that must be met if an in-school alternative is to be judged as positive.

A commitment to design and implement an effective in-school alternative to suspension necessarily implies a recognition of the negative consequences of the frequent use of out-of-school suspensions. Because it is an opportunity for a new beginning, it is important for the development of any in-school alternative to be preceded by a period of reflection and thought.

The process of reflection should represent an effort to assess the purpose, practice, and effect of the use of suspension. That process might be facilitated if administrators take the time to arrive at honest and thoughtful answers to the following questions:

- Why has our school used out-of-school suspensions?
- In what ways have out-of-school suspensions limited our ability to help students and solve problems related to school discipline?

- What group(s) has borne the consequences of our use of out-of-school suspensions, and why? What has been the impact of these suspensions on the persons affected?

- How have we monitored and evaluated the effect of our use of out-of-school suspensions?

- What effects of our use of out-of-school suspensions do we not want to repeat in other disciplinary efforts?

- To what extent has our school's use of out-of-school suspensions been at our own discretion (as opposed to suspensions mandated by school board policy or district office directives)?

- What has been our experience regarding the relationship between the behavior of school personnel and the behavior of students? How have we accepted responsibility for remedying the inappropriate behavior of individuals from both groups?

- How do parents, teachers, and students perceive the system of discipline within the school? What are their attitudes and expectations regarding discipline? How do these relate to my own philosophy and practice?

The answers to these questions may provide some understanding and insight from which valuable lessons may be drawn and applied to the development of an in-school suspension alternative. On the other hand, developing an alternative in the absence of such reflection may mean the mistakes of the past will re-emerge in a new guise to corrupt the intended benefits of the alternative.

School officials who are developing in-school alternatives to suspension should make sure their efforts are based on a solid philosophical foundation. If they believe the primary purpose of the alternative is to punish students, to control students, or to modify the behavior of the students, then it is unlikely that the long-term results of the alternative will differ much from the results of other disciplinary practices conceived within a similar philosophical framework. Again, however, the development of an in-school alternative provides an opportunity to reassess past assumptions and practices and to take a different approach.

The problem with many disciplinary practices is that they are designed more as an expedient response to real or perceived student misbehavior than as an effort to identify and remedy the cause(s) of the behavior. The maintenance of authority, control, and status too often determines the nature of the disciplinary response, frequently to the exclusion of helping the child or solving the problem which is

at the root of the child's misbehavior symptom. Such responses not only result in ineffective disciplinary practices, but they can lead to a school official's abuse of power.

In-school suspension alternatives should be developed for the purposes of: (1) helping the child; (2) identifying and remedying the root problem(s) responsible for the real or perceived commission of a disciplinary offense; (3) helping the student develop self-discipline; (4) gaining knowledge about the factors contributing to discipline-related problems, and initiating preventive measures to reduce those problems; (5) eliminating the use of out-of-school disciplinary suspensions for all offenses except those which clearly threaten the security of the school community; and (6) providing a framework within which school personnel can work to achieve the first five goals, while enabling the majority of the students in the school to continue to participate, without interruption, in the school's instructional process.

Certainly these are goals based on a philosophy that discipline in the schools goes beyond issues of punishment and control, and that suggests school officials have an extensive responsibility to students. But unless the goals of an in-school suspension alternative are developed on this or a similar philosophical base, the potential of the alternative may not be fully realized.

It is important to recognize that the objective of an in-school alternative must not be restricted to merely reducing the number of out-of-school suspensions. Detention programs which address none of the other goals stated above have succeeded in achieving the limited objective of keeping students in school, but it is highly questionable whether students have really been helped or whether future problems have been prevented. In-school alternatives to suspension which result only in students sitting in a room are irresponsible management techniques which, over the long term, are not likely to help either the student or the school.

Such misuse of in-school alternatives also provides a convenient means for ignoring the fact that the student may be only one factor in the root problem responsible for his or her real or perceived misbehavior. It does little good to involve a student in an in-school alternative if there is a prejudgment that it is always the student's misbehavior which needs to be modified. School officials must be willing to come to grips with the fact that the root problem of a student's misbehavior may also be found, in whole or in part:

- In how a teacher manages his/her classroom or relates to students;

- In the hasty judgments of school personnel whose reactions are based on partial information, on cultural/racial stereotypes, or on their personal values;

- In a range of other school-related, peer-related, home-related, or community-related factors.

While school officials are often willing to acknowledge the role of peers and the student's family as possible contributors to a student's misbehavior, they are less frequently willing to acknowledge or address school-related factors. If in-school alternatives perpetuate the inclination to modify the student's misbehavior symptom, but do not provide a context for identifying and remedying the root cause of the problem -- wherever it is found and whomever it involves -- then the alternatives will represent "discipline as usual" for the student and the school.

If an in-school alternative is to provide a framework within which problems are to be solved -- not merely ignored, misclassified, or removed from the classroom -- then school officials must be committed to developing an alternative that permits the program staff to make an objective analysis of what the problem really is and gives them the power and support to deal with it. If the misbehaviors of peers, teachers, administrators, and parents are found to be a major factor leading to student misbehavior, then those behaviors must be addressed. This should be done even when the recognition and confrontation of such behaviors threaten the status quo of the power relationships and the political dynamics in the school community. Of course, it must be recognized that peers, teachers, administrators, and parents -- like students -- are prone to human error and bad judgment. As in the case of students, they often need help in identifying the source of the problem and confronting their own role in it.

The design of an in-school alternative should reflect both an ambition to deal more substantively and successfully with student misbehavior and a sense of realism based on an intimate knowledge of student needs, and on the informal structures and relationships in the schools. This means that teachers, administrators, students, and parents should be involved in designing the in-school alternative. It is essential for this planning process to be deliberate and thoughtful, and for all the participants to be well informed about various alternative models. Designers of an in-school alternative to suspension should consider the following major components.

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR REFERRAL

The in-school alternative should not be viewed as the solution to every case of student misbehavior in the classroom, nor should it be assumed that the referral of a student to the alternative is the best response to every violation of the school's rules. If in-school alternatives result in removing and isolating a student from the regular classrooms, and if that process is easy and convenient for the classroom teacher, then there is the temptation for the teacher or adminis-

trator to abdicate his/her responsibility for effective discipline in the classroom and the school. Therefore, there must be a clear statement of the circumstances under which a referral to the in-school alternative is appropriate and of the procedure for making the referral. This statement must be communicated in writing to the school's staff, students, and parents.

It is also wise to designate a specific person to be the "gatekeeper" of the in-school alternative. This administrator or other [illegible] staff member should be the person who screens all referrals to [illegible]lternative in order to determine if such referrals are appropriate and necessary to solve the root problem. Such an individual must not assume a role of "processing" referrals, as some assistant principals have processed out-of-school suspensions in an assembly-line fashion. Further, this "gatekeeper" must have the authority to evaluate the need for and the wisdom of the student's referral to the alternative based on a preassignment investigation involving conversations with the student, his/her parents, and the referring educator. This person should be empowered to assign or not assign the student to the in-school alternative and, when appropriate, to recommend the use of less formalized alternatives which would more likely meet the student's needs and more quickly return him/her to the regular classroom.

A referral to an in-school alternative must be accompanied by sufficient documentation to justify the referral. The documentation should state what incident or behavior prompted the referral and what efforts were made to identify and solve the problem prior to referral. A teacher's written suggestions or comments to facilitate the identification and solution of the problem responsible for the referral should also be solicited.

As another part of the referral process, the student should be afforded the minimal due process rights outlined in Goss vs. Lopez before the assignment takes place. The student should be advised as to why the assignment has been recommended, and should have an opportunity to present his/her side of the story. This conversation may also provide clues about the root causes of the problem. Such a procedure is simply good administrative practice, and it may have the added benefit of providing some legal protection for the school system and its personnel.[5]

LENGTH OF ASSIGNMENT

If one assumes that many in-school alternatives will take the form of assigning the students to a separate facility within the regular school, the issue of how long the student will stay there becomes very important. In most cases an assignment of from 1 to 3 days will probably be sufficient to work with the student, to try and identify the problem, and to initiate a process for effectively dealing with the problem.

No student should stay in the program for more than 3 days without a review of his/her progress during the first 3 days. Any recommendation that the student remain in the program beyond 3 days should be accompanied by documentation detailing the rationale for the recommendation, the activities and services proposed for the student, and what is to be accomplished during the remaining days. The review process should include an examination and discussion of this documentation in a meeting of the referring teacher or administrator, the person who assigned the student to the program, the student and his/her parents, and any member of the in-school suspension staff. Of course, under no circumstances should a student ever be in the program for more than 7 days without a full due process hearing.

IN-SCHOOL PROGRAM FACILITIES

If the assignment of a student to a specific place within the school building for a specific period of time is part of the in-school alternative, attention needs to be given to the location of this facility. It may be a classroom that is not in use, a portable classroom, or even a converted storage area. One school even set up a program in an unused area behind the stage. Regardless of what kind of facility is used, it should be somewhat removed from the normal traffic patterns within the school. This serves several purposes. It provides the social isolation which can sometimes motivate the student to "get his act together" and complete his stay in the program so he can resume his social role in the regular school environment.[6] It also removes the facility from curiosity-seekers among other students and decreases the chances of undesired interruptions. It can spare the students some embarrassment since they are not seen going in or out of the in-school suspension facility.

The facility should probably be an austere setting which does not provide the visual stimulation usually found in normal classrooms. Chairs, desks or study carrels, bookcases, and file cabinets are all that is required. However, the student should have access to study materials and aids that would otherwise be available in the regular classroom. If there are students who are assigned to the facility primarily because of misbehavior symptoms resulting from serious academic problems, the facility should also include programmed instructional materials and books and other materials specifically geared to the academic level of the students. If the experience of the in-school suspension program begins to reveal that many students assigned to it are there because of academic problems, it may be necessary to change the in-school alternative to one which is more clearly designated as a skill development center.[7] In that case, the facility would be different from the one described here because the emphasis would be on academic remediation rather than on discipline.

STAFF SELECTION AND RESPONSIBILITIES

There is no more crucial aspect of developing an in-school alternative to suspension than selecting the staff who will work with the students assigned to the program. The development of the alternative must not be seen as an opportunity to reassign an undesirable teacher from a regular classroom to the alternative program. Instead, the staff of the program must be selected from a group of individuals who:

- Want to work with the program;
- Want to work with children who have problems;
- Have demonstrated their ability to work successfully with youngsters with problems;
- Can relate well to youngsters with a variety of class and cultural orientations;
- Are more interested in identifying and solving real problems than merely in responding to or modifying misbehavior symptoms; and
- Are patient, caring, and committed to students.

If possible, certification criteria should be a secondary consideration. It is more important for the prospective staff member to be able to communicate with troubled students, to have strong diagnostic and instructional skills, and to have the energy and imagination to utilize a variety of school and community resources to help solve problems.[8]

The interview and selection process of the staff for the program could be aided by creating a special selection panel. The panel should include administrators and teachers who are experienced and successful in working with the types of students who may be assigned to the in-school alternative program. The panel must make it clear to the applicants why the program is being initiated, the goals and objectives of the program, what support the staff will have from the school system, what authority the staff will have, and an indication of the school system's commitment to the program.

Staff for the alternative program can be expected to have many different responsibilities. Aside from supervising students in the program, they will have to provide counseling opportunities for students and work to establish a personal rapport with them. The staff will have to assist students with academic assignments and be sensitive to possible learning problems which may become apparent in working with them. It will also be necessary for staff to make judgments as to when students can profit from utilizing school or community-

based services, and then to facilitate the students' use of those services. It is probable that staff members will also have to relate to members of the students' families and possibly visit their homes. In other words, the staff member must be able and willing to be resouceful and flexible in responding to a broad range of student needs.

RELATION OF CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL TO ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM

Another important dimension of the in-school alternative program is how it is perceived by regular classroom teachers and school administrators and how they relate to it. It is critical that the regular school personnel understand the philosophy behind the program, why it has been created, and how it will work.

The best chance for gaining the understanding and support of such personnel is to make special efforts in the initial stages of planning to discuss the concept with them, receive their views and suggestions, and incorporate their ideas into the program when appropriate. How the program operates, regardless of how it is defined or how the administration thinks it should operate, will depend on the degree to which it is understood and supported by the regular school staff.

Alternative programs which involve temporarily assigning students to a separate facility in the school will necessitate teachers sending a student's daily assignment to the staff of the alternative program. This assignment may be the same as that given to other students, or it may be tailored so as to be more intensive and to require more activities of the student who is assigned to the alternative. In either case, there will have to be a close working relationship between the classroom teacher and the staff of the alternative program.

Teachers and administrators may also have to work with the alternative program staff to assist them in identifying and correcting the root problem responsible for the student's misbehavior. This will take time, and it may not always be a pleasant experience since the teacher or the administrator may be part of the problem. For this reason, the regular school personnel need to understand that the alternative program staff have the strong support of school district officials and that there is an expectation that classroom teachers will cooperate with the program's staff. As a part of its commitment to provide comprehensive support to the staff, the school district should be prepared to provide in-service training, counseling, and other assistance to school personnel who are unwilling or unable to recognize and remedy the role they play in stimulating or aggravating student misbehavior.

PARENTS AND THE ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM

It is also necessary for the staff of the alternative program to involve the parents of students in discussing and analyzing a student's behavior. This may be a long and difficult process that may require home visitations. But it is vital for parents to know as much as possible about why their child is in the alternative program and what the program is trying to do for the student.

A routine process of involving parents can also provide a way to educate parents about the reasons for the substance of the school's expectations of the student's behavior. There can be no substitute for direct, face-to-face contact between the staff of the alternative program and parents of students in the program. This component of the program is essential to its success.

CONTENT OF IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS

Certainly, it should be made clear that if students are in an alternative program which temporarily removes them from the regular class, they must receive a quality of instruction comparable or superior to that they would otherwise receive. Such instruction should be at a level appropriate for each student. Any tests or other important work being given in a student's regular classroom should also be available to the student in the in-school alternative program. Thus, the student who is in the alternative program should not be academically penalized or be permitted to do nothing in the program. The academic component of the alternative program should be more rigorous, more challenging, more appropriate, and more rewarding than in the regular classroom.

The staff of the alternative program must be vigilant for student academic problems resulting from learning handicaps, inadequate previous preparation in the lower grades, inappropriate instruction, or the use of inappropriate materials. Solving these problems may require more time and resources than are at the disposal of the alternative program staff. Therefore, some program to aid the student with these problems will have to be prescribed after a process of teacher consultation, a formal assessment of the student's achievement level, a review of the student's academic history, and an intensive diagnosis of the student's learning process problems which need special attention. A plan to solve the student's academic problems should be developed, shared with and explained to the student and his/her parents, and carefully monitored.

The in-school alternative should also include a component which involves individual or group counseling. Unless there is some opportunity to work with the student -- and also with parents, peers, and teachers -- within the context of a counseling model, it is unlikely

the root problem of the student's misbehavior will be identified or that the student will be successfully involved in its solution.

The specific counseling approach utilized will depend on the theoretical framework within which the in-school alternative has been organized. While approaches using behavior modification, reality therapy, values clarification, Adlerian psychology, and transactional analysis are employed by many programs, the model should be consistent with the goals set forth earlier in this paper. Accordingly, it is not appropriate to use counseling models which manipulate the student or which start from the assumption that it is only the student's behavior that needs to be modified. Approaches which tend to mask or misidentify the root problem should be avoided. The object of the in-school alternative program is not to produce a passive, adaptive student or to pound the round peg into the square hole. The in-school alternative program should not be a forum in which counseling techniques have the effect of denigrating the student's culture or community. Rather, the purposes of counseling in the alternative program should be: (1) to involve the student in identifying and assuming some responsibility for solving the root problem responsible for his/her misbehavior; (2) to assist the student in confronting the reasons for his/her misbehavior and that of others; (3) to assist the student in analyzing the relationship between his/her behavior and his/her short- and long-term self-interests; and (4) to assist the student in accepting responsibility for and in learning how to manage his/her behavior and to cope more responsibly with the behavior of others.

SUPPORT SERVICES FOR THE ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS

While the in-school alternative program may be somewhat separate from the activities of the regular school program, its staff must have access to the school system's support services. In developing the program, thought must be given to how such school personnel as psychologists, attendance workers, special education consultants, counselors, community relations staff, ombudspersons, and transportation supervisors will relate to the alternative program staff in order to assist them in working with students. Attention should also be given to establishing contact with and involving individuals from such community-based agencies as legal aid offices, mental health centers, community centers, churches, social service agencies, and the like.

These school and community support personnel must also understand the purpose and method of operation of the alternative program. They should know what is expected of them and meet regularly with the alternative program staff. If the alternative program staff are to effectively utilize these support services, it will be necessary for them to develop personal working relationships with the support personnel in order to have their cooperation and understanding when they are asked to become involved in helping particular students. In all

cases, the staff of the alternative program should serve as the advocate for the students with whom they are working, both to assure that the support personnel provide prompt and quality service and to protect the students' interests. In no case, should students simply be "turned over" to the school or community support personnel.

FOLLOW-UP

Once a student leaves the in-school alternative program, it is important to have some process of follow-up to determine how the student is getting along in regular classes. One component of this follow-up should be to determine how successful the in-school alternative has been in helping solve the root problems of the student's misbehavior. One approach is to use a form or card which enables each teacher whom the student sees throughout the course of the normal school day to indicate how the student is getting along in class. This is turned over to a school administrator, with a copy to the alternative program staff, at the end of each school day. Short-term support from the alternative program staff may be necessary if this procedure indicates that the student is continuing to have some problem.

It may also be wise to plan some follow-up counseling sessions so the student will be able to provide feedback as to how he/she is doing. It is preferable for the in-school alternative to be organized so that its "alumni" can take the initiative to temporarily (2 hours or less) return to the program for follow-up counseling with any member of the program's staff with whom the student has developed a special rapport. Such follow-up sessions should be available to the student at any time during the school day on an emergency basis and should be preceded by the student's notification by an appropriate teacher or administrator that the student is returning to the program.

FUNDING

The extent to which additional funding may be required to provide the services and staff for an in-school alternative program depends largely on how creatively an administrator uses the services and staff already available and on the number of students that may be involved in the program. It should not be assumed that an in-school alternative cannot be implemented without additional funding. Before such a conclusion is reached, school officials should think carefully about what kind of arrangements can be made using available staff.

If additional resources are required, there are a number of possible sources for funding. In those school districts where superintendents and school boards are thought to be sympathetic to the goals of the in-school alternative, they should be asked to provide local

funds to support the program. In other school districts, it may be necessary to seek outside funding if that seems to be the only strategy for getting the program established. The Emergency School Aid Act can provide funds to eligible districts for a range of services and personnel if the districts meet the program's criteria. Title IV-C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act can also provide funds. Some staff for the alternative program may be funded through the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act is the only Federal legislation which specifically provides funds to "prevent unwarranted and arbitrary suspensions...."[9]

MONITORING AND EVALUATING THE ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM

The in-school alternative should be carefully monitored and evaluated at regular intervals throughout the school year to determine if it is achieving its intended purposes. The following questions may provide a useful framework for determining the success of the program:

- Has the program actually resulted in a significant reduction in the number of out-of-school disciplinary suspensions? (Compare suspension data from prior to the implementation of the alternative program with data for a comparable period of time while the program has been in operation.)

- What do data concerning referrals and assignments to the alternative program reveal? (Compile data which include information on the race, sex, and grade level of students referred to the program; which compare the number and types of students referred with those actually assigned to the alternative program; which reveal the number of referrals made by individual teachers or administrators; which indicate how many students spent how many days in the alternative program; which cite the reasons students were referred and/or assigned to the program; and which provide information on the number and types of students who were referred and/or assigned to the alternative program during a given period of time.)

- Have students involved in the in-school alternative program significantly increased their academic, social (coping, interpersonal skills), and attendance success as a result of having participated in the program?

- Has the alternative program resulted in students' developing greater self-discipline (as manifested by their not being assigned to the alternative more than once)?

- o Has the alternative program resulted in more parents being involved in the disciplinary process?

- o Has the alternative served a broad range of students (by sex, race, socioeconomic background, etc.) who have violated school rules, rather than served only one group identified as "the discipline problem"?

- o Has the alternative served only those students most in need, or has it been excessively used as a disciplinary response? (Check to see if the number of students participating in the in-school alternative is equal to or more than the number of students formerly receiving out-of-school suspensions.)

The monitoring and evaluation of the alternative program should involve the program staff, classroom teachers, administrators, and a representative from the district office. The assessment should result in a report which includes the kind of data indicated above, relevant anonymous case histories, and comments from school personnel, students, and parents. An interim report of this type certainly should be prepared at the conclusion of each semester that the alternative program is in operation; a more extensive report which also includes cumulative data and a thorough analysis of the program's impact and deficiencies should be prepared at the end of each school year.

This paper has outlined some of the qualitative parameters that should be considered in designing and implementing in-school alternatives to suspension. It is now a truism in American education that the quality of any given program is largely dependent upon the commitment of those who plan the program and upon the leadership and energy which they bring to its implementation. That is also the case with in-school alternatives to suspension. In-school alternatives will not work for the benefit of students if they are implemented grudgingly or if they are supervised by individuals who do not believe in the philosophy upon which the program is based.

What has been outlined in this paper is not a panacea for all discipline-related problems in public schools. It will not eliminate the damage that can be caused by the inappropriate disciplinary responses of educators who are not adequate to the task of relating to students with problems.[10] But if carefully planned, and if guided and implemented by skilled educators, an in-school alternative program can result in more effectively meeting the disciplinary needs of students and schools.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Ten consecutive school days or less.

[2]Children Out of School in Ohio, Citizens' Council for the Ohio Schools, 1977. (Available for $2.00 from the Citizens' Conncil, 517 The Arcade, Cleveland, Ohio 44114.)

"Close-Out Report," prepared by Eugene Limar and Lynda Wright, Special Student Concerns Project, Bureau of Technical Assistance, Louisiana State Department of Education, November 1976 - March 1978.

Community Opportunities for Educational Directions Project, North Carolina Human Relations Council, August 31, 1977. (Available free of charge from Department of Administration, Human Relations Council, 116 W. Jones Street, Raleigh, N.C. 27603.)

The Governor's Task Force on Disrupted Youth, Phase I Report, Task Force, State Capitol, Tallahassee, Florida, September 14, 1973.

Project Student Concerns Interim Report, Jefferson County Education Consortium, Louisville, Kentucky, September 14, 1977.

Rates, Reasons, Recommendations, a study of student suspensions by the South Carolina Human Affairs Commission (Linda Jones, Project Coordinator), June 1976.

School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children?, published by the Children's Defense Fund, 1520 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, September 1975.

Title VII Special Student Concerns Interim Report, Louisiania State Department of Education, Bureau of Technical Assistance (Eugene Limar, Coordinator), November 1976.

[3]The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 includes a finding by Congress that "juvenile delinquency can be prevented through programs to keep students in elementary and secondary schools through the prevention of unwarranted and arbitrary suspensions and expulsions."

[4]There are a number of publications which describe in-school alternatives to suspension. Programs currently in operation are described in the newsletter Creative Discipline, published by the Southeastern Public Education Program of the American Friends Service Committee during 1977-78. (Available for $7.00 from AFSC-SEPEP, 401 Columbia Building, Columbia, S.C. 29201.) Other programs are described in materials available from the National Association of Secondary School Principals and other professional organizations.

[5]For recommended due process procedures for in-school suspension, see Section 9 of the plaintiff's proposed discipline code in Morgan vs. Kerrigan. (Available from the Children's Defense Fund, 1520 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.)

For recommended procedures for temporary removal from class, see Section 7.5.5 of the Model Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities. (Available from the Center for Law and Education, 6 Appian Way, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138.)

There are a number of potential legal questions surrounding an assignment to an in-school alternative program and the "rehabilitative" purpose, activities, and effects of the program. See "In-School Suspension Practices and the Prison Hospital Experience," David K. Wiles and Edward Rockoff, NOLPE School Law Journal, Volume 7, Number 1, 1977. (Available for $2.50 from NOLPE, 5401 S.W. 7th Avenue, Topeka, Kansas 66606.)

[6]Attention needs to be given to the degree of isolation which is desirable in this type of program. Some programs do not permit students in the program to eat with other students (lunch trays are brought to the in-school program room). Other programs require that students go to the bathroom at a time when no other students are in the halls. Students in alternative programs are sometimes prohibited from participation in extracurricular activities that may be held during or at the end of the school day.

[7]Schools should be receptive to learning from the experience of the in-school alternative program. In some cases, it may be necessary to make significant curriculum and instructional adjustments in the regular school program if it becomes clear that the academic needs of some students are not being met. The strong support of the school district's central office may be necessary to help a school determine if, when, and how such adjustments should be made.

[8]Some schools have found that, because of the personality of the person in charge of the in-school program, and because students in the programs usually receive more individual attention and care than in the regular classroom, some students welcome the opportunity to be assigned to the program. This is most likely to happen when the real problem has not been adequately addressed and the student views the in-school program as a haven. Thus, assignment to the program may be seen by some students as a positive experience and may inadvertently be responsible for students' causing problems (so they will be assigned to the in-school program). The occurrence of this phenomenon should be anticipated. Careful records should be maintained to determine if the same students are returning to the program constantly and, if so, why.

[9]A detailed description of various Federal sources of funding for in-school alternative programs can be found in the April 1978 issue of Creative Discipline.

[10]For example, educators may quit suspending students but begin to routinely refer "behavior problem" students for evaluation and placement in programs for the emotionally handicapped or the educable mentally handicapped. The absence or low incidence of the suspensions cannot be assumed to indicate the presence of appropriate responses to students with problems.

SESSION VI

DISCUSSION OF DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING EFFECTIVE IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION

George P. Edmonston, Jr.
McKinley M. Nash, Ph.D.

COMMENTS OF MR. EDMONSTON

During the past 2 days, those of us in attendance at this conference have had the opportunity, through the many excellent presentations preceding this session, to learn something about a few of the many types of in-school suspension alternatives currently in use. Because of these efforts, I, for one, now have a much clearer understanding of some of the programs school systems nationwide are using to reduce incidents of student misbehavior.

In the presentation just heard, Mr. Mizell shared with us certain points to consider before, during, and after implementing such alternatives. I have been asked to share my reactions to Mr. Mizell's paper on designing and implementing successful in-school alternatives to suspension, and soon will begin my presentation with some comments in this regard. Yet in my presentation I want to do more than just offer for consideration the traditional line-by-line examination of the paper under review. Therefore, I plan to close my brief remarks with what I consider to be five characteristics of successful in-school alternatives to suspension. As I do so, most of you will recognize that at least some of what I say has, at one time or another during this conference, been touched upon, however briefly. Please be assured, however, that my purpose will be not merely to reiterate, but rather to exchange the greatest number of ideas to the greatest extent possible. I, for one, would feel remiss in my responsibilities as an educator if, given the opportunity to share information, I were to do otherwise.

Keeping this in mind, then, let me begin by saying that even a cursory reading of Mr. Mizell's paper is enough to convince the reader that it is well-written, lucid, and professionally sound. And although he has failed in his footnotes to give me credit for a publication that caused me much "wailing, moaning, and gnashing of teeth" 2 years ago, his paper is well-documented. In short, Mr. Mizell's presentation is evidence of the fact that his reputation in this area is well-deserved.

At this point, I want to depart for a moment from my thoughts concerning the presentation under review and talk very briefly about

something that has, in the few days I have been here, served as a continual source of frustration for me. In doing so I hope, as the saying goes, to "set the stage" for further comments about the paper we have just heard.

In short, I came to this conference on Sunday anticipating answers to questions that for too long now have, at least for me, gone unanswered. What training, for example, should classroom teachers, at those schools where in-school suspension alternatives are in operation, receive to ensure that what they do in their classrooms to deal with disruptions complements the activities of the alternative? Do group counseling activities change attitude, behaviors? If so, which group counseling techniques work better than others? Are there behavioral problems with which in-school programs of this type are not equipped to deal? If this is true, what are these behaviors? Of all the valuing techniques in use today, which ones are most effective in helping students become more responsible for their behavior? And so on and so forth. Certainly, I have received some answers to some of these questions, yet many others have gone unanswered. For these, I need information which could help explain some of the specifics about just what it is an in-school suspension alternative can provide in the way of enhancing the educational experiences of a young person in trouble.

By the same token, Mizell's paper lacks the specificity that one would have hoped to have found in its pages. Certainly, it was a pleasure to hear Mr. Mizell suggest that such programs include "plans to solve the students' academic problems," and "an individual or group counseling component" for "assisting students in confronting reasons for misbehavior" and for "involving the student in identifying and assuming some responsibility for solving problems." Yet how much more exciting it would have been to have heard our speaker provide some specific techniques that could be used to implement some of these components, or some specific suggestions on how one might involve students, in the words of Mr. Mizell, "in identifying and assuming some responsibility for solving root problems."

As indicated earlier, I will use my remaining time to share what are, in my opinion, five programmatic characteristics that I have found to be in evidence in those exemplary programs currently operating in Louisiana.

- First, these programs are located in schools headed by principals who are totally committed to the idea that school disciplinary practices must provide opportunities for misbehaving students to receive help. Moreover, these administrators view the in-school alternative to suspension as a means by which students can receive assistance when they get into trouble.

- Second, the faculties at these schools consider this type of alternative to be very efficacious in dealing with student recalcitrance. Unlike schools that have unsuccessful programs, those schools with exemplary programs do not have a so-called "lifeboat" atmosphere in which teachers ensconce their lack of confidence in such programs by always having at-the-ready other traditional punitive disciplinary techniques to use in case a 2-day stint in the program fails to produce a change in student attitude.

- Third, the principals or selection committees in these schools have employed qualified personnel to staff their programs. By qualified personnel I mean educators who understand the so-called "world view" -- the values and beliefs of a person and how they serve to influence or how he/she perceives the world -- of those students with whom they will periodically work during the course of a school term.

- Fourth, most of these programs involve students who get into trouble in activities that will help them feel they are a part of, and not alienated from, the extracurricular activities available at their respective schools. I suppose you could say, in the words of Dr. Glaser, that these programs are providing students the opportunity to take a "stake" in their schools. One school in southern Louisiana, for example, discovered early last September that most of the students who had been suspended or expelled the previous year had little or no involvement in extracurricular activities. So now, on 'Club Day," when many students at this school are released from their classes to attend speech or beta club meetings, all those pupils who were referred at least once during the year to the in-school alternative for help are allowed, if they so choose, to attend a club meeting of their own, right in the alternative room.

- Finally, and most importantly, these programs exist in schools where they are just a part of the overall discipline and not the only technique or system used to discipline students. For example, many of these programs use a tiered system of referrals and conferences -- that is, teacher/student conferences, referral to a guidance counselor, administrative conferences, and so forth. If these conferences fail to provide help, a referral to the in-school alternatives or to some other person or agency is made to help rectify the students' problems. Each activity in the process is normally followed in sequence, with opportunities provided at each level for a post-haste return of the students to their regular school routine. At no time during the entire process are students made to feel that somehow the school has "given up" on them.

My thanks to the National Institute of Education, and in particular to Dr. Garibaldi, for providing me with this opportunity to comment on Mr. Mizell's presentation and to share a few of my ideas on in-school alternatives to suspension.

COMMENTS OF DR. NASH

I would like to use my time for presenting a response to Mr. Mizell's speech on designing in-school alternative programs by focusing on a very successful program currently operating in our high schools. The Motivational Lab is an in-school program which has remedied some of the discipline problems in the district through the close coordination of activities by teachers and administrators, as well as through the involvement of parents. I will briefly highlight some of the Lab's features.

Suspensions represent slightly more than 15 percent of the total Evanston Township High School school population, and over 60 percent of those suspended have been black. Therefore, an alternative to suspension must be a priority.

The human relations component of the project involves the concepts of: (1) providing a satisfying educational experience for students enrolled in West School who normally would be suspended from school or end up as dropouts; and (2) modifying the behavior of these students. The three units of West School refer students to a centrally located Motivational Lab. The students referred to the Motivational Lab are those who have been referred to the Dean of Students, Assistant Principals, or Principal for disciplinary reasons and those students who are potential dropouts. The Motivational Lab is a suite of two rooms set aside in the school, used for individual and group counseling and for small group and/or individualized instruction. The rooms are staffed with a director, a counseling teacher, and a teacher-aide (CETA trainee).

The counseling component is an important aspect of the Motivational Lab concept since many problems experienced by students are problems resulting from a poor self-concept. Students who feel that they have very little to offer and see no place in the school where they can make any worthwhile contribution need attention in the home, the school, and the community. When students reach certain stages of depression, they often tend to release their anxieties and frustrations on the nearest person or "thing," and a hall or classroom problem is the result. In order to provide a "cooling-off" period for such students, they are assigned to the Motivational Lab where they receive counseling, as well as the opportunity to do at least part of their classroom assignments.

The period of time a student remains in the Motivational Lab depends upon several variables. The nature of the infraction and the

attitude of the student have a great influence on the length of time spent in the Lab. However, the student is considered in regular attendance in school activities, where feasible, and is given the opportunity to make up any work that may be missed while away from the regular class.

There are continuous lines of communication open between the counseling teacher in the Motivational Lab and the regular classroom teacher, with the responsibility on the part of the student for regular classroom assignments. The idea is to provide uninterrupted instruction for the student who would normally be suspended and to make serious attempts to modify undesirable behavior. The activities in the Motivational Lab involve instruction in academic areas on a more individualized basis than is possible in the regular classroom, as well as both group and individualized counseling. These activities provide a place, materials, and personnel to help the student make the adjustment necessary for his return to the regular classroom. The Skills Lab, Math Lab, Language Lab, and other resources are used extensively in the project.

The Motivational Lab provides opportunities for personal interactions. Students are able to sit down and discuss their problems with an adult who has ample time to listen. This process helps students resolve their problems rather than having the school remove them from the instructional environment.

In addition to the efforts of the counseling teacher and teacher-aide, two Outreach Workers visit the homes of students who have been recommended by the Unit Administrator. The Outreach Workers serve as liaisons between the home and the school, helping parents, school administrators, and teachers to understand mutual problems and concerns. Supported by accurate background information, the Outreach Workers offer suggestions for resolution of problems.

In-service activities are planned for both professional and non-professional personnel. Many problems encountered in West School can be solved or alleviated when staff members are fully aware of the causes of such problems. Staff members meet and exchange ideas on ways of dealing with problems in school. They have opportunities for listening to resource persons skilled in interpersonal relations and for discussing various avenues or approaches in dealing with certain types of problems. The services of the Illinois Office of Education have been secured, at no cost, to furnish additional consultative participation.

The following is a list of major objectives for the project:

1. Reduction in the number of suspensions by 30 percent (i.e., total suspensions including repeaters).

2. Reduction in the number of students suspended by 30 percent.

3. Reduction in the number of suspensions among blacks by 30 percent.

An administrator assigned to West School coordinates all activities of the program and evaluates the program in an effort to determine the extent to which objectives are being met. The clerk-typist assigned to the lab keeps records of the project and students served.

The Motivational Lab offers positive counseling and rehabilitation, may uncover unknown or unforeseen personal problems, may reinforce good classroom teaching, offers behavior modification for students, and offers students a chance to excel and build confidence so that they may continue to achieve. However, the Motivational Lab is not a detention room, a permanent catch-all for undesirable students, a recreation room, a cure-all, to become more desirable than the classroom and a substitute for all suspensions. (Certain misbehavior still carries an automatic suspension.) To assure maximum utility of the program, the classroom teacher must:

1. Provide current work for a student in the Motivational Lab.

2. Make it a point to let that student know he will be welcome back to class when his behavior is modified. (Stop by the Motivational Lab to encourage the student during planning period.)

3. Alter the personality conflict as positively as possible from a teacher's standpoint.

4. Devise ways to implement positive reinforcement of desired behavior.

As I have stated earlier, assignments to the Motivational Lab are made by the Principal, Assistant Principals, and Dean of Students only. In addition, the general staff is discouraged from threatening students with the possibility of sending them to the Motivational Lab. Nevertheless, repeated assignments to the Motivatinal Lab can result in the student's being suspended or assigned to other alternative programs within the district. Hopefully, if these procedures are closely adhered to, any school district can implement a successful in-school alternative program, and I welcome you to contact me for further information. Thank you.

SESSION VI

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MS. CECILLA: I am Laura Cecilla, I would like to ask how one might encourage self-referral into these programs?

MR. MIZELL: I think that is a good point which I obviously did not address. Before I try to answer, I would like to thank the respondents; for I assume that part of the purpose of this panel is to help everyone think about developing and implementing an in-school alternative, and I believe that the presentation of different points of view and different experiences is very helpful. I hope these divergent points of view will also be represented in the proceedings that will ultimately be published.

I think you raise a very good point. I may well be looking at isolation as a factor motivating the student to treat what he encounters in the in-school suspension program with a little more seriousness than perhaps he would were it just part of the regular school program. If isolation makes the in-school suspension less desirable to a student than having contact with his friends, then perhaps he will be more inclined to get down to business a little more quickly.

I hope that the self-referrals take place within other components of the school program which do not have the disciplinary stamp on them. I am making an assumption that an in-school alternative is, in fact, a disciplinary tool, a response, that most people are going to see it as such, and that most school administrators are going to conceive and implement it as such. For the students who just have a problem and want some help, there are other components of the school program -- the counseling component, their relationship with an individual teacher, staff member, or administrator -- that should be utilized so that the students do not have to appoint themselves to the center.

Maybe some people disagree with this concept. I suppose one could argue that in-school programs should just be a regular part of the school program. If that happens, in-school suspension programs take on a different character -- one which is a disciplinary response. I am assuming that most administrators in this country are, in fact, going to respond to violations of school offenses from the point of view of discipline.

What I am suggesting is that we change some of the things which brought the student to that disciplinary context in the first place. I think this is a legitimate point which should be open to discussion and reflection.

MR. BILLINGS: I'm Charles Billings from Florida State and with Project Concern. I have a short version and long version of my question. First, I want to say to Dr. Nash that in Florida we had 78,000 suspensions last year. Black youngsters were suspended two or three times more than white youngsters.

The short version of the question is this: What do you regard as a success or a measurement of success in in-school suspension programs? And the long version of the question is the following. It seems to me that all the strategies that have been suggested are based upon a student's carrying his or her share of the blame for his or her predicament. But it also occurs to me that the root causes that Mr. Mizell mentioned for disruption are located in the racial attitudes and behaviors of school personnel and policies. If those root causes are not eliminated, then the in-school alternative to suspension will be disproportionate, as is the out-of-school suspension. And the reasoning of the black suspended student that he or she is not the cause of his or her predicament will be supported. So it seems to me that an in-school alternative to suspension cannot work until this equity -- disciplinary equity -- is achieved in the school system or at least approached. That's the question.

DR. NASH: That's put very well. I would say that one of the measures of success is and can be an indicator of failure also. One of our stated management objectives was to reduce outside suspensions by 50 percent. Since there were a disproportionate number of black suspensions, we wanted to reduce the disparity between white and black students. What happens is that you get the same kind of racial profile in the in-school suspensions. That is why you must be sure that the in-school suspension is of high quality as far as the teaching and learning situation is concerned. Then you ought to begin to look at the nature of the in-school suspension. I think Mr. Mizell's paper addressed that well.

But you also must have someone in the in-school suspension who has some clout in the school system, because sooner or later you are going to be able to identify staff who frequently suspend students. What we have done is to identify among the 12 schools some administrators who have a disproportionate number of suspensions in their buildings. Now, what you have to do then is find a way to work with those individuals to determine if they in fact have an unusual population. Our population is assigned by social security numbers. I don't think they're loaded. So that's not a real reason.

MR. MIZELL: I would just like to add to that. I have another presentation in which I give school personnel the warning that identifying and treating the root problem may be dangerous to one's professional health, because the root problem may be centered not in the child, but elsewhere in the school. If one tries to take on the political dynamics of the school community, the power structure that

is, then I think he is taking a risk, just as he would be in the larger community.

But this is not to say that such a thing does not deserve to be done. As you point out, some very fundamental problems will not be resolved until this is done.

MR. EAKIN: My name is Louis Eakin and I am with University Research Corporation. I would like to thank Dr. Nash for some of the concrete suggestions he provided, and I would like to ask one other thing. You mentioned that there was a distinction between those youngsters with disciplinary problems and those who, for example, threatened the life of the students or teachers. I am just curious. How do you handle the very, very serious and extreme cases? Do you put them in your in-school suspension program, or do you isolate them separately?

DR. NASH: We isolate those youngsters at home in what we call administrative homebound, and those youngsters are isolated no more than 5 days. We can suspend in Illinois up to 10 days. But I am afraid that can become convenient. We isolate them until we can get our school psychologist or someone over to see if that behavior is particular to that incident, or we ask the parents to bring the youngsters back in the school.

Now, that is removal from school and the teacher comes around to them for 1 hour a day. That happens for a serious situation involving a weapon or an assault, but not a fistfight among two boys. That is an attempt to do real bodily harm to someone or someone who's attempting to do bodily harm to himself, and many of our youngsters today who use drugs are attempting to destroy themselves by jumping off something or through something.

So we confine them either for their own safety or the safety of others if the problem becomes severe enough. I am not against an expulsion to an in-school suspension provided proper educational facilities are available.

QUESTIONER: If you had your druthers, would you do it that way, or would you try those youngsters in the in-school suspension program? Do you think that's desirable or is it a political necessity?

DR. NASH: It's both. It's a political necessity from a liability standpoint if a youngster is perceived as being dangerous by a staff member or he needs to be removed either for his safety or for the safety of others. Now, we know there are people in our adult population who have to be confined. So it's reasonable to think that there are people in our adolescent population who have to be confined for a period of time for specific reasons. I think we confine too many.

So I would not use the in-school suspension as a catchall for all kinds of behavior. I think that we expect in our Motivational Lab the same kind of quality teaching on an independent, individually prescribed basis that goes on in the classroom. And we can't expect our people to do that when they have a threat of bodily harm to them or others.

MR. BOARDS: Yes, my name is William Boards. I'm from Battle Creek, Michigan, and principal of a junior high alternative education program. I did not come here to criticize you who have given us information. I came to seek information.

You know, in the education field many of us educators think that we can quiz other educators. We're all important. I'm concerned with this one thing to take back. And that is, at the same time that we started our alternative education program, we started a gifted child program. I find that the considerably gifted receive a lot of publicity, and they say these kids are not in this program because of their own doing.

When it comes to the alternative program, where we handle behavior problems, absenteeism, academic deficiencies, and tardiness, we find that the general attitude is that these kids are here because of their own doing. In the 4 years that I've been the principal, we've found that some of these kids test as geniuses. Yet it is difficult to get any publicity in order to obtain the proper financing, or to get the cooperation of the community because the program itself is camouflaged. But the gifted kid is constantly publicized. Could you give me some information about how this could be done?

DR. NASH: You know, what occurs to me when you ask of the need for some effective PR in terms of those kids that you have identified in your alternative program, it is something almost along the theme of the United Negro College Fund: "A mind is a terrible thing to waste." That is, if you have potential that has been identified in that in-school program, it really becomes a question to me as to what purpose is that ability and brilliance going to be put once that person is in the larger society?

Is it going to be put to a purpose which is for the person's own personal good as well as society's, or is it going to be used destructively? I'm sure that in our correctional institutions we have many people who are highly competent, but the problem is that competence did not get recognized perhaps, or at least channeled in a very constructive way early on. One needs to communicate to the community that they have a stake in trying to help these folks at a very formative period of their lives, instead of having to deal with them later on when they're either going to be in the unemployment lines, in the welfare offices, or in correctional institutions.

MR. LINZ: My name is Bob Linz. I'm kind of taken with the deja vu being here these last couple of days because the kinds of qualities and traits you're talking about in these teachers is what Bill Morse at the University of Michigan talked about 35 years ago, the crisis resource teacher. For years I have been training people in these kinds of skills that we have heard talked about -- transactional analysis, Gestalt therapy, behavior modification. What I have never been able to do is get them to want to use those when they get caught in the conflict.

And so what I really want to end up saying is that, after all the discussion of erudite models and philosophy, I want to thank you, Dr. Nash, for dealing with the issue that everybody said is important, the root problem in the personality characteristics of the teacher-administrator. Right on.

MR. TURNER: I am Winston Turner from the National Association of Elementary School Principals. I may have missed this in Mr. Mizell's talk, but it seemed to me that he spoke of evaluative criteria only in terms of the student. Is there some evaluation of the staff also?

MR. MIZELL: I think that is a good point to keep in mind, and I think you are right. I did not indicate that clearly. However, when you are compiling information on who has made the referrals, I think that in itself will be a kind of evaluation: Has Mr. Jones made 15 referrals and Mrs. Smith made none?

It would be helpful, I think, if in such a report there were some indication as to how many teachers had in fact been worked with as a result of having made a referral. In how many cases did teachers make referrals when the student never got to the in-school suspension program -- the "gatekeeper" decided this situation could be handled another way? Perhaps there then occurred some negotiation with the teacher, and that student was returned fairly and promptly to the regular classroom. Again, I think you raise a good point that I did not address clearly enough.

MR. HASLAM: I notice that our time is up. I would like once again to thank the panelists for sharing their expertise with us. We are going to move right into our final session. So you may stand up for a few minutes. If any of you try to leave, we may have to suspend you.

SESSION VII

CLOSING REMARKS

Junious Williams, J.D.

Throughout the 3 days of this conference, numerous participants have raised the issue that the meeting has not answered the question of how to solve the problem of student discipline. It seems as though some participants came expecting to find the solution prepackaged and ready to be taken back to the local district for implementation. My expectations for the conference were somewhat different. I saw it as an opportunity to generate discussions, share ideas and strategies, and review some specific in-school alternatives. Finally, I felt the conference might allow us to determine whether we are asking ourselves every question possible before we proceed too far with in-school alternatives or any other strategy for impacting upon the serious discipline problems in the nation's schools.

But perhaps it is most important to share something other than my expectations. I would like to emphasize my observations on the need to respond cautiously to the disciplinary situation, especially with regard to in-school alternatives.

The difficulty I see in launching into in-school alternatives (or any other program for discipline) involves the factor of risk. The causes of discipline problems are extremely complex; solutions are even more so. There is some indication that in-school alternatives have worked effectively in some settings. However, we have very little data by means of which to examine this impact carefully and to determine why these programs have been effective, and for what students and what types of problems they have worked. At the same time, some evidence indicates that the types of problems that specific schools are encountering may differ in nature as well as degree.

I feel, then, that we must perform two types of analysis. First, we should critically examine the needs of each school (assessment). Second, we should use the information on existing programs to determine how they may meet the needs of their particular schools and how we might alter them or implement them in other schools (modification).

I think this process of assessment and modification is important in the area of in-school alternatives, especially because most, if not all, of the programs described during this conference require personnel, facilities, materials, and training -- all of which cost money. If we proceed too quickly and without adequate assessment, modification, and planning, the programs will achieve only marginal success. And such results will exacerbate the situation by diminishing the pro-

grams' credibility in the eyes of the board and community, at the same time providing evidence and arguments for detractors and loss of vital time in the educational lives of young people who cannot afford it.

Another major issue to which I would like to respond briefly involves a perspective for our current examination of in-school alternatives. As I indicated earlier, I am still somewhat cautious about how beneficial in-school alternatives will or can be. Because of this cautiousness, I believe that in-school alternatives simply constitute an interim measure for addressing the immediate crisis in student suspensions and lost instructional time. To the extent that we approach them as the ultimate solution, we may be steering a course away from other necessary aspects of restructuring student discipline.

This brings me to a much larger issue underlying our concern about suspensions; namely, that we need to do a much wider assessment of what is generating the current crisis in student discipline and what basic restructuring needs to occur within discipline systems to make them more functional. For the most part, schools seem to operate according to nineteenth century concepts of the student, the school, and the society, and these bear little relation to the reality of the seventies.

I think that we need to start at ground zero. We need to ask ourselves some critical questions. What are realistic and effective philosophies of discipline? What are we attempting to accomplish by structuring rules and by giving certain people within the school environment authority to make what may constitute educational life or death decisions over students? We need to re-think what direction we are attempting to pursue with respect to student discipline.

We must also look again at the policies and practices underlying the administration of student discipline; we must determine how discipline is operating and how we want it to operate. In the process, we must deal with issues such as one we have discussed superficially throughout the conference: the possibility that not all suspended students may be guilty of the charges which have resulted in their suspensions and that the rules may be inappropriate in the first place. If rules are not sound and if they do not adequately reflect what is occurring and what is acceptable to a wide cross-section of people, we only create another set of problems.

We need then to establish a reasonable set of rules which teachers and other staff can feel comfortable in consistently enforcing and by which students can feel secure in abiding. I think one of the problems with policy is that we often look at staff people as being valueless. We give them a set of rules which we assume everyone accepts and understands. If a staff member does not accept or does not understand a school's rules for student discipline, then he or she will most probably be reluctant to enforce them. This leads to differential patterns

of enforcement, which may well be among the critical factors leading to the kind of disproportionality we see in the rate of suspensions for minority students. So it is quite clear that we do need a sound set of rules which we can all generally agree will be foundational in the schools. Then we need to set about the business of enforcing those rules consistently by training staff about them and monitoring their enforcement.

Another major issue that I would like to address, which was articulated again this afternoon at the final session, is that our programmatic directors and approaches still place all the blame on the students. Over the course of these 3 days we have looked at a number of models, most of which implicitly describe and define the problem as having its basis in the student. However, administrators and teachers, two particularly important role groups in the discipline system, have a direct responsibility for what is occurring in terms of student discipline. Administrators have responsibility with regard to providing due process hearings. Some evidence leads us to suggest that Goss vs. Lopez really did not mean very much except insofar as it gave administrators a process with which they could feel comfortable in suspending students; it did not actually change what goes on in the office. For example, in one school we found that 97 percent of the referrals the administrators received resulted in a finding of guilt on the part of the student. This raises some serious questions, especially given some evidence indicating that 45 percent of the students denied guilt or offered mitigating circumstances to explain their behavior. So with regard to hearings and applying due process, there is a conflict with which we do not seem to be dealing very effectively. This would appear to indicate that administrators need training, support, and assistance in making independent decisions about the guilt or innocence of students and the appropriateness of disciplinary action.

I think one of the factors that arises continually in discussing due process with school administrators involves the relationship between the building administrator and the staff. Quite frequently, administrators strongly believe that they need to support their staffs. They demonstrate such support by routinely affirming decisions made by classroom teachers and other staff regarding referrals and the appropriateness of student behavior. I think this contributes to the kind of results we see in terms of administrators not making independent decisions. For they sincerely believe that, to support the staff, they must deny that students may be right some of the time. This is a rather serious problem, especially as it relates to giving students a sense that the system is about fairness and about justice.

Finally, in restructuring student discipline systems, we must look at some of the legal aspects of in-school alternatives. We have discussed the issue of legal protection surrounding the placement of students in in-school alternatives as it relates to due process, equal

protection, and informed consent. But we also need to discuss the structure of these in-school alternatives so that we provide more protection than we do in cases of simple suspension. Some of the activities that people have suggested must be part of in-school alternatives may create problems; the purpose of those activities may be questioned, and they may be accused of having potential for causing some psychological damage in the student. In my estimation, the best way to accomplish this objective is by developing stringent due process protections which adequately inform parents and students of the consequences or potential consequences of placement in the programs and by providing parents and students with adequate means of preventing unwarranted and illegitimate placement of students in the programs.

In terms of a major summary statement of what has occurred during the conference, one of the things that has displeased me somewhat -- not so much about the conference, but rather about all of us and how we are approaching discipline -- is that we all seem to be rather disorganized. I think to some extent this difficulty was manifested yesterday by the Federal panel, to which I was looking for some consensus on how we are going to deal with the very serious issues inherent in suspensions and in-school alternatives.

I think that a number of things need to happen. First, we have to coordinate our efforts so that, when we leave here, we do not forget about the problem until another conference is convened to respond to problems caused by the alternatives' failure to work. We need, then, to keep in contact, to utilize our collective information so that each of us can make the most informed decisions possible. Second, we need to put much more time into specifically developing and validating in-school alternatives, as well as into discipline systems and approaches generally. For a year from now an individual considering an in-school alternative such as the PASS Program should be able to understand the reasons behind and results of that alternative before he puts a lot of his own time and energy into adapting or implementing it. This way, the individual can avoid having his district commit itself to providing resources for a project which may well fail -- and having later to solidify the conservatives within the community who are against the expenditure of funds for "problem students" in the first place. This is something with which we must be really concerned, because if we fail as advocates for the in-school alternative movement, the next time we have to go back to the Board of Education for other funding sources, we will encounter a great deal of resistance to providing any more money for such activities.

Yesterday morning Congresswoman Chisholm gave us a charge. She said that, because of her responsibilities and activities, she could not coordinate a movement toward putting what we know and what we think is needed in the realm of in-school alternatives together into a legislative response. She did indicate, however, that if we were willing to commit the time and effort necessary for developing such a

plan, she would be more than willing to facilitate our efforts to make sure that review of that plan was accomplished. I think this may be one of the most important outcomes of the conference and something we should not leave the Shoreham Hotel without doing. This may be an opportunity for all of us to obtain the kinds of monies or legislative support -- or in fact to obtain the legislation itself -- that we must have in order to carry on exemplary programs. It may also be the mechanism for resolving some of the problems with coordination inherent in trying to address the issue of student discipline.

So again, I think that before we leave, we should all share our names and information and outline some initial and immediate steps, so that we can follow up on Mrs. Chisholm's charge, and then perhaps have some more substantial outcomes which will help all of us to deal more effectively with the problems of discipline, suspension and in-school alternatives.

APPENDIX: BIOGRAPHIES

Yvonne Blanchard is an education policy fellow with the Associate Commissioner for Equal Opportunity Programs, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Office of Education. She holds an M.Ed. in counseling from Loyola University and a Ph.D. in educational policy and social psychology from the University of Massachusetts. Dr. Blanchard is currently on leave from the Montclair (N.J.) public schools, where she is an assistant superintendent. Previously, she was a teacher and counselor in the Los Angeles Unified School District and director of the supportive services component of the Educational Opportunities Program at California State University, Northridge. Dr. Blanchard is the author of several articles and producer of a television program on the educational problems of minority students.

Boyd Bosma is a specialist in civil liberties and intergroup relations with the National Education Association. He received a B.A. degree from the University of Michigan and M.Ed. and Ed.D. degrees from Wayne State University. Before joining NEA in 1968, Dr. Bosma was a classroom teacher in Michigan and directed the Research Task Force on Racism in Education for the Michigan-Ohio Regional Laboratory. Dr. Bosma's work has concentrated on problems of minority groups in education, and he has served on numerous bodies involved in issues of equal educational opportunity for changes in Federal desegregation policy guidelines. He has been particularly active with respect to student pushout issues and conducted the first national organizational meeting on this topic in 1972. Dr. Bosma's publications include School Desegregation Guidelines for Local and State Education Associations, as well as several articles dealing with the role of teachers in desegregation, testing, and student rights.

Thomas J. Boyle is coordinator of the COPE Program, North Allegheny School District, in Pittsburgh. He received an A.B. degree in psychology from Youngstown State University and M.A.T. and Ed.D. degrees from the University of Pittsburgh. In addition to developing, organizing, and implementing the COPE Program at North Allegheny for school norm violators, Dr. Boyle has acted as a consultant to various school systems in the development of alternative programs for hard-to-reach youth. His publications include: "COPE: An Alternative to School Suspension," Journal of the National School Development Council (Winter 1974); "Positive Peer Culture Counseling," Associate Public School Systems Yearbook of Teachers College, Columbia University; "Early Detection and Treatment of School Maladjustment," Journal of the National School Development Council (Fall 1977); and "Effects of Group Counseling on the Self-Concept of Students Identified as Deviant," doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh (1977).

Alfred T. Clark is administrative coordinator of the Educational Options Services Branch, Los Angeles Unified School District, where he is responsible for the Opportunity Education, Continuation High Schools, Community Centered Classrooms, and Alternatives Schools Programs. He is also a member of the board of directors of three LEAA-funded juvenile diversion programs (Projects HEAVY, Central, and JADE), and he has served for 5 years as assistant to the area superintendent of 28 inner-city Los Angeles schools. Mr. Clark received an A.B. from the University of California, Los Angeles, and an M.A.Ed. from the University of California; he is a doctoral candidate at Nova University. He is the author of and consulting editor for several English and social studies texts designed to help disadvantaged students succeed in schools and avoid in-school problems that might result in suspension.

Milton L. Crosby is coordinator for the Emergency School Aid Act Programs, Jefferson Parish School System, Harvey, Louisiana. He received a B.S. in elementary education from Grambling State University, an M.Ed. specializing in elementary mathematics from the University of New Orleans, and a Certification in Administration and Supervision from Southeastern University. Mr. Crosby serves as the coordinator of the Jefferson Parish Alternative to Suspension (Intervention Rooms) Program, and he has been a resource person on alternatives to suspension with the Education Resource Center at Tulane University at its workshops throughout the State of Louisiana.

Jean Dye is vice president for legislative activity with the National Parent Teachers Association. She also serves as a member of National PTA's committees on bylaws, budget, legislative program, and nominations for commission members, and she is a member of that organization's TV Project Commission and Urban Advisory Task Force. Mrs. Dye, who has long been active in PTA activities at the national, State, and local levels, is also president of the Ohio Council for Education and second vice president of the Ohio Advisory Council for Vocational Education. Her other memberships include the Ohio School Boards Association, Title III ESEA State Advisory Council, Mental Health Development Center, Vocational and Manpower Planning Services, and Family Services Association.

George P. Edmonston, Jr., is a program specialist for the Technical Assistance Bureau of the Louisiana State Department of Education. For the past 3 years, he has conducted workshops throughout the State of Louisiana for paraprofessionals, teachers, students, parents, and school administrators in the areas of human relations, classroom management techniques, students rights and responsibilities, and alternative education. Mr. Edmonston is co-author of Alternative Education in Louisiana: Descriptions of Selected Programs and Louisiana's first student rights and responsibilities handbook. He has also written articles on corporal punishment in Louisiana schools and on human relations and in-school suspension alternatives.

170

Antoine M. Garibaldi is an education policy fellow with the National Institute of Education. Dr. Garibaldi received a B.A. in sociology from Howard University and a Ph.D. in educational psychology from the University of Minnesota. He is a former elementary school teacher, a school psychologist, and most recently served as director of the St. Paul (Minn.) Urban League Street Academy. During his fellowship year with NIE, he has lectured extensively in the United States and Canada on suspensions and explusions, alternative schools, and in-school alternatives to suspension.

Morris Gordon is a teacher with the Behavior Modification Clinic (Douglas School) in Chicago. He received an A.A. from Chicago City College and a B.A. from Chicago State University; he is presently enrolled at Chicago Circle Campus. Previously, Mr. Gordon served as an acting dean in Tampa, Florida, and as program director for the Y.M.C.A. He has also participated in conferences involving the Chicago Teachers Union and the American Friends Service Committee, and he is active in the field of behavior modification.

Richard Green is West Area Superintendent of the Minneapolis public schools. He previously served as principal at the North Community High School, an urban education center; as director of organizational development for the Board of Education, Minneapolis public schools; and as administrative assistant for desegregation/integration for the Office of the Superintendent of Schools and the Minneapolis Board of Education. Dr. Green's publications include: Educational Renewal for the 1970's, Minneapolis Public Schools; and Human Relations: A Response to Racism Through Curriculum.

Belita A. Heron is an education policy fellow assigned to the Subcommittee on Select Education, U.S. House of Representatives. Ms. Heron received a B.A. from the University of San Diego and has done graduate work in education at California State University, Northridge. She previously served as a legislative assistant in the office of Representative Shirley Chisholm; as a special assistant to the vice president at Meharry Medical College in Nashville; as director of Project Community at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; and as a high school teacher in San Fernando, California.

Irwin A. Hyman is professor of school psychology and director of the National Center for the Study of Corporal Punishment and Alternatives in the Schools at Temple University. He has worked extensively in the areas of school psychology and clinical services, as has served as a consultant to many schools on problems of discipline. Dr. Hyman's publications include works on child advocacy, classroom management, and corporal punishment, and he is co-editor of School Consultation, 1977.

John Carl Kackley is supervising and consulting psychologist for Project PASS in the Pinellas County School District, St. Petersburg, Florida. He received B.A. and M.A. degrees from Indiana State University. Mr. Kackley has been a school psychologist for 20 years, and he has been with Project PASS since its inception in 1972. His publications include: "Humanistic Activities in the Regular Classroom," Florida P.P.S. Bulletin, and "P.A.S.S. -- Process and Content."

Crystal Kuykendall is director of the Constituency Coordination Department for the National School Boards Association, where she coordinates services and program activities for urban school districts and minority school board members. She holds a B.A. from Southern Illinois University, an M.A. from Montclair State College and an Ed.D. from Atlanta University. Dr. Kuykendall was formerly director of the Citizens Training Institute of the National Committee for Citizens in Education, and she has worked as a public school teacher and as an Upward Bound instructor and trainer for the Community Action Training Institute in Jersey City, New Jersey. She has also taught in the black studies and sociology departments at Seton Hall University and in the Education Department at Montclair State College. In 1978, Dr. Kuykendall was appointed by President Carter to the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education; she will assume Council leadership in September 1979.

Bruce Mackenzie-Haslam is a researcher at the National Institute of Education, where he has been involved in a study of student suspensions in urban junior high schools and has participated in national workshops related to the NIE Safe School Study. He holds a B.A. degree in sociology from the University of California at Davis and M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in educational foundations from the State University of New York at Buffalo. He has been on the faculties of the State University of New York at Buffalo and Georgia State University. Dr. Mackenzie-Haslam also has conducted extensive research on urban schools, with particular emphasis on the development of open classroom models, and he has served as consultant to school systems on urban education issues.

M. Hayes Mizell is associate director of the Southeastern Public Education Project of the American Friends Service Committee. He has been a senior fellow in southern and Negro history at the Institute of Southern History and The Johns Hopkins University, and has done graduate work in American history at the University of South Carolina. Mr. Mizell has also served as a member of the Richland County District #1 (Columbia, S.C.) Board of School Commissioners. He is co-author of School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children?, a report by the Children's Defense Fund of the Washington Research Project, Inc., and has written journal articles on the use of suspension and on the status of desegregation in the South.

Oliver C. Moles heads the Home and Community Studies Team at the National Institute of Education. At the time of the Conference on In-School Alternatives to Suspension, he was head of the School Social Relations Staff at NIE, where he collaborated on the Institute's Safe School Study and monitored research projects. Dr. Moles received a Ph.D. in social psychology from the University of Michigan. He has taught courses in marriage and the family and in delinquency studies, and he has conducted studies of peer counseling and teacher expectations. Dr. Moles is co-editor of a recently published book, Divorce and Separation.

Gerald Morris is assistant director of educational issues with the American Federation of Teachers, where his primary areas of work include: school violence, crime, and discipline; teachers' occupational stress; trade unions and labor studies; and assisting AFT locals with survey and research methodologies. He earlier served as director of collective bargaining with this same organization. Prior to joining AFT, Dr. Morris did graduate work in sociology at Harvard University, receiving a Ph.D. in 1977.

McKinley M. Nash is principal of the Evanston Township (Ill.) High School and teaches part-time at Northwestern University. He also currently chairs the National Science Foundation's Commission on Human Resources. Dr. Nash received an Ed.D. from the University of Illinois at Urbana and has done postdoctoral work in finance. Previously, he taught graduate courses at Northwestern University, and he has served as director of vocational/secondary education in the Shreveport (La.) school system and as school principal at the elementary and secondary levels. His publications include "Guidance Assessement Program Planning and Intervention" and "Secondary Schools and a Change in Society: This We Believe."

Richard Jay Nelson is assistant principal of Albion High School, Albion, New York, where he handles discipline and student attendance problems and directs the in-school correction center. He received B.S. and M.S. degrees in educational administration and a Certificate of Advanced Studies from Oswego.

William T. Pink is professor and chairman of urban education and educational foundations, University of Nebraska, Omaha. He holds a Ph.D. from the University of Oregon. Dr. Pink has taught school in the United States and England, served as a senior research fellow at the National Institute of Education, and been a consultant to school districts and youth agencies. His research interests center around the sociology of urban schools, youth deviance and delinquency, and social policy and research methodologies. Dr. Pink is the author of numerous articles and monographs, and he is editor of The Urban Review.

Lynn Pinkerton is youth services specialist at the Student Referral Center, Black Junior High School, in Houston. She received a B.A. in sociology and psychology from Stephen F. Austin University, and has completed course work for an M.S. in social services and social rehabilitation from Sam Houston University. Ms. Pinkerton previously served as area director for the Neighborhood Centers Association and as a caseworker at Faith Children's Home in Houston.

Paul B. Salmon is executive director of the American Association of School Administrators. He holds a B.A. from Whittier College and M.S.Ed. and Ed.D. degrees from the University of Southern California. Prior to assuming his present position in 1971, Dr. Salmon served as superintendent of five California school districts over a 15-year period. He has also served as visiting professor at California State College in Long Beach and Los Angeles and at Claremont Graduate School. Dr. Salmon is listed in Who's Who in America and Who's Who in Education, and he has written numerous articles on school administration.

Roger J. Scales is director of guidance services for the Montclair (N.J.) public schools. In this position, he is administering a non-traditional guidance program that supplements and extends regular guidance services. Mr. Scales received a B.S. from Fayetteville State University and an M.S. from Indiana University at Bloomington; he is a doctoral candidate at New York University. Previously, he was administrative assistant to the Hickory (N.C.) Superintendent of Schools and director of guidance for the Englewood (N.J.) public schols.

Junious Williams is associate director of the Project for the Fair Administration of Student Discipline at the University of Michigan School of Education. Earlier, he served as director of the Saginaw (Mich.) Student Rights Center Research Center Project. Mr. Williams' publications include: The Rights and Responsibilities for Michigan Public School Students (1972); "Due Process in School Disciplinary Proceedings," Breakthrough (1974); Student Behavior Rights and Responsibilities, and the Fair Administration of Discipline (1975); and Student Rights and Discipline: Policies, Programs, and Procedures (1978).

• U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1979 628-948/2181